

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AGAINST THE WAR IN VIETNAM

We are **federal employees**, opposed to our nation's policy in Southeast Asia, who view with daily, personal anguish the actions taken in Vietnam by the government for which we ourselves work.

From our position we have seen how the purpose and energy of government are drained by preoccupation with the making of war. We have seen how progress in foreign policy has been obstructed. We have seen how massive national resources are absorbed by a disastrous war while critical domestic needs are inadequately met. And seeing this, we fear the political and moral consequences for the future of our country.

All this, together with the tragic and unnecessary suffering of the Vietnamese people, has troubled our conscience and now compels us to speak out to colleagues and fellow citizens.

We call then for the war's end — which we believe is in America's power to bring about. We call upon our Chief Executive to change his policy in Vietnam, to end his reliance on military force, and to seek instead a genuine political settlement to bring peace to Southeast Asia.

(The Hatch Act provides that "An employee or individual to whom subsection (a) of this section applies retains the right to vote as he chooses and to express his opinion on political candidates and subjects." 5 USCA 7324)

I (we) agree in substance with the statement of **FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AGAINST THE WAR IN VIETNAM**, and understand that my name will appear in a newspaper advertisement as a signer. I am a Federal employee.

(PLEASE SIGN LEGIBLY)

ADDRESS (OPTIONAL)

PHONE

Lastly the T.B. test. Again no explanation. You follow directions. I could still ~~hear~~ the machine going so I kept my chin on the surface until the nurse finally convinced me I could get dressed and go back to the waiting room. But when the woman came to discharge me she just said you can go. No "You have T.B.; You don't have T.B.; We will tell you next time" The lady expecting her 2nd child and I left together & went to the coffee shop which turned out to be a room of machines. She stuck it out with them but I went to the live cafeteria. Was unimpressed with the choice of food for a hospital. ~~XXXXXX~~ Getting home was another 1/2 hour wait for the bus thanks to our wonderful D.C. transportation system. One poor lady got on with a \$1. I don't know what she finally did because she seemed reluctant to give it up for a script. We are now on the script system all day and night. You pay 25 Plus 2 pennies or our pay a token (4 for a \$1) or you give the man ~~XXXXXX~~ money and he gives you back a piece of paper which you can cash in at certain spots and get your \$ back I guess.

Reviewing the whole situation even from a medical point of view I am struck by the kind of failures which can occur. While the student and I talked about anemia and how important iron is for the baby etc., while I told him the lady doctor I had seen put me on ferrus sulfate after meals and how I had quit taking them after awhile—I will not know for 2 weeks if I am still anemic. Nor have I been told to return to the pills but I will anyway. That doesn't strike me as being a good situation & probably would never happen to a private patient. He did tell me somewhat to my chagrin that the baby is just about formed now in any case & my diet will make little difference to him or her. He tried to take the edge off my reaction to that. However a fact is a fact.

By the way interesting to note that except for the 2 obetetric nurses, the doctor and student and a few old people (general patients) & one receptionist Possibly a volunteer there were no white people (And both white nurses were "Miss". Typical situation.

All and all I believe that the people here whether patient or worker are suffering in a system which is not properly ordered. I am now a confirmed socialist vis-a-vis medicine. And I don't think I will ever go to a private doctor again without being aware of who is paying on the other end for my privacy & how we are all paying dues indirectly one way or another along with the clinic patient in our daily ^{inter} course by suffering from their lack of health, dignity and their childrens as they go about their life among us...or I suppose I should say among the more fortunate. The doctor would have looked a lot happier if he had more time, fewer patients etc I'm sure but his fellow doctors in the capitalist world cause him this climate. I am grateful for the spirit of the few students but they are working against tremendous odds. As Dick -Read points out the most important resource ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~

Social

odds. As Dick-Read points out the most important resource of the country is the children and look where our priorities are vis-a-vis medical care? I am so grateful for his book Childbirth Without Fear which does bring me some peace of mind.

Julius Hobson makes a distinction between our political and our economic system. I like it and as soon as I'm in a position to do so I am going to read into it. Actually I am struck by the fact that despite my education I still don't understand \$ and how it works vis-a-vis stock market. Somehow I get the impression that it is some international game in which some wealthy American nationals have all the odds and are stacked to win. I don't guess it's any accident that one of the few people I know interested in playing the stock market is Paperbag, the houseman at Golden Q Pool Hall at 7th & T. Memmi's book and even Robert Kennedy's pre-selection book (although I'm sure he didn't intend it) caused me to question these matters and some years back Cauldwell's The Role of Labor in Modern Society. In the latter's chapter on planned economy he puts it this way- How can we ask in conscience a few men in \$ to plan properly use of resources that effect the destiny of a large % of a country's people? I have the impression that this question gets buried when the political system and economic system are not considered separately. I for one like many Americans don't feature a Prime Minister (we Irish just got out ~~from~~ under that) I like our form of representative government although I think it needs some reform and a lot more implementation. What I don't like is our economic system. This week I pay about \$75 to 3 private doctors who gave me some 2 1/2 hours of their time, including 2 internal exams, 2 lab reports. One of them did nothing but talk with me for 1/2 hour. That's about \$25. per hour on an average. In total I will pay \$150. for some 3 days in the hospital & probably 7 visits to the clinic. I begrudge those private doctors the money and I feel like telling them when I pay my bill they have just participated in the making of a socialist... Of course I could be wrong but I don't think they would like to hear that.

brief

(Gambling)

Lastly the T.B. test. Again no explanation. You follow directions. I could still ~~hear~~ the machine going so I kept my chin on the surface until the nurse finally convinced me I could get dressed and go back to the waiting room. But when the woman came to discharge me she just said you can go. No "You have T.B.; You don't have T.B.; We will tell you next time" The lady expecting the 2nd child and I left together & went to the coffee shop which turned out to be a room of machines. She stuck it out with them but I went to the live cafeteria. Was unimpressed with the choice of food for a hospital. ~~XXX~~ Getting home was another 1/2 hour wait for the bus thanks to our wonderful D.C. transportation system. One poor lady got on with a \$1. I don't know what she finally did because she seemed reluctant to give it up for a script. We are now on the script system all day and night. You pay 25 Plus 2 pennies or our pay a token (4 for a \$1) or you give the man ~~XXX~~ money and he gives you back a piece of paper which you can cash in at certain spots and get your \$ back I guess.

Reviewing the whole situation even from a medical point of view I am struck by the kind of failures which can occur. While the student and I talked about anemia and how important iron is for the baby etc., while I told him the lady doctor I had seen put me on ferrous sulfate after meals and how I had quit taking them after awhile-I will not know for 2 weeks if I am still anemic. Nor have I been told to return to the pills but I will anyway. That doesn't strike me as being a good situation & probably would never happen to a private patient. He did tell me somewhat to my chagrin that the baby is just about formed now in any case & my diet will make little difference to him or her. He tried to take the edge off my reaction to that. However a fact is a fact.

By the way interesting to note that except for the 2 obstetric nurses, the doctor and student and a few old people (general patients) & one receptionist possibly a volunteer there were no white people. And both white nurses were "Miss". Typical situation.

All and all I believe that the people here whether patient or worker are suffering in a system which is not properly ordered. I am now a confirmed socialist vis-a-vis medicine. And I don't think I will ever go to a private doctor again without being aware of who is paying on the other end for my privacy & how we are all paying dues indirectly one way or another along with the clinic patient in our daily ^{social} ~~inter~~ course by suffering from their lack of health, dignity and their children as they go about their life among us...or I suppose I should say among the more fortunate. The doctor would have looked a lot happier if he had more time, fewer patients etc I'm sure but his fellow doctors in the capitalist world cause him this climate. I am grateful for the spirit of the few students but they are working against tremendous odds. As Dick-Read points out the most important resource ~~XXXXXX~~

odds. As Dick-Read points out the most important resource of the country is the children and look where our priorities are vis-a-vis medical care? I am so grateful for his book Childbirth Without Fear which does bring me some peace of mind.

Julius Hobson makes a distinction between our political and our economic system. I like it and as soon as I'm in a position to do so I am going to read into it. Actually I am struck by the fact that despite my education I still don't understand it and how it works vis-a-vis stock market. Somehow I get the impression that it is some international game in which some wealthy American nationals have all the odds and are stacked to win. I don't guess it's any accident that one of the few people I know interested in playing the stock market is Paperbag, the housesman at Golden Q Pool Hall at 7th & T. Memmi's book and even Robert Kennedy's pre-election book (although I'm sure he didn't intend it) caused me to question these matters and some years back Cauldwell's The Role of Labor in Modern Society. In the latter's charter on planned economy he puts it this way- How can we ask in conscience a few men in it to plan properly use of resources that effect the destiny of a large % of a country's people? I have the impression that this question gets buried when the political system and economic system are not considered separately. I for one like many Americans don't feature a Prime Minister (we Irish just got out from under that) I like our form of representative government although I think it needs some reform and a lot more implementation. What I don't like is our economic system. This week I pay about \$75 to 3 private doctors who gave me some 2 1/2 hours of their time, including 2 internal exams, 2 lab reports. One of them did nothing but talk with me for 1/2 hour. That's about \$25. per hour on an average. In total I will pay \$150. for some 3 days in the hospital & probably 7 visits to the clinic. I begrudge those private doctors the money and I feel like telling them when I pay my bill they have just participated in the making of a socialist... Of course I could be wrong but I don't think they would like to hear that. *(Gambling)* *brief*

Campaign Budget, Recommendations

Six Main Budget Categories

1. Candidate Expenses
2. Campaign Activities
3. Organizational Activities
4. Headquarters Expenses
5. Personnel
6. Advertising (includes public relations, surveys)

- A. In campaigns with a total budget of less than \$25,000 75% of the funds should be allocated to item #6
- B. The larger the budget, the more broad based exposure is needed to win. Ads and PR are best for wide exposure.
- C. Polls should be taken to determine the identification factor of the prospective candidate. These polls may be conducted by reliable, well-instructed volunteers, but the questions should be drawn up and the data interpreted by someone familiar with sociological and/or political interpretations of the questions.
- D. If possible obtain a "voter profile" of the entire district and of individual areas within the district to determine campaign tactics in specific areas.

E. Determine what support, if any, is available from existing political parties and organizations re: fund-raising, support, organizational assistance, manpower.

F. The lower the budget the greater the need for a cohesive and efficient campaign staff. Volunteers although a necessary part of every campaign are often unreliable as a day-to-day work force. For this reason it is imperative that advisors and permanent office staff be determined well in advance of the campaign. Permanent staff should include one person responsible for scheduling of candidate appearance, a fund raiser, a Press secretary, a campaign manager, an "inside" worker responsible for coordinating volunteers and work flow within the office (one or more of these jobs may overlap however it is imperative that only one person is responsible for fund raising and that lines of responsibility be clearly drawn and understood). The people should have previous political experience and wide community contacts - the political experience could be waived in the case of the fund raiser; the community contact in the case of the office coordinator and press secretary if their political experience or availability warrant such a waiver.

G. The candidate should not be concerned

with the minute to minute happenings within the office. While all position papers, news releases, press statements, etc. should be OK'd by the candidate and while most ideas for such releases will probably originate with him it is not essential that he actually write each statement, in fact position papers may be a joint effort of the candidate and his closest advisors.

Sample Budgets

Total Budget	5,000	50,000
1. Candidate Expenses		
A. Travel	50	1,000
B. Autograph	50	1,000
2. Campaign Activities		
A. Rallies, etc.		500
B. Phone Contact	150	2,750
3. Organizational		
A. Youth Activities	100	1,000
4. Headquarters Expenses		
A. Rent	250	1,500
B. Utilities	50	300
C. Insurance	75	300
D. Equipment Rental	75	250
E. Phones	50	800
F. Postage	150	1500
G. Stationery	200	2400
H. Office Supplies	50	1,000

Somper Budget, Cont'd.

Total Budget 5,000 50,000

Headquarters Expenses

J. Janitorial 200
J. Decorations 300

5. Personnel

A. Mail Service 2,000
B. Headquarters help 2,000
C. Secretaries 2,500
D. Field personnel 2,500

6. Advertising-PR

A. Direct Mail

1. General appeals 600 3,000
2. Vertical appeals 300 2,500

B. Outdoor Billboards

1. 24 sheet 1,000
2. Junior 500 500
3. Spectacular 500
4. Production 100 300

C. Radio - TV

1. Spots no TV TV 3,500
radio 450 Radio 1,500

2. Production

D. Newspapers

1. Dailies 300 3,000
2. Weeklies 150 1,000
3. Metro 150 500
4. Production 100 500

E. Publicity

1. Release forms 200 300
2. Newspaper flats 200
3. Photos 100 100

Sample Budget, cont'd.

pg. 5

Total Budget	5,000	50,000
Publicity		
4. Postage	200	400
F. Printing		
1. Handout cards	200	200
2. Bumper strips	300	300
3. Yard and cor signs.		400
G. Research / Surveys		
1. Vertical media		
a. Lodge, fraternities, religious publications	100	1,000
	5,000	50,000

Comments:

A

This is intended as a guide not as a rigid pattern. The sample budget was taken from a book entitled How to Win Your Campaign published by Prentice-Hall. There are individual items within this budget which may not apply to your campaign; items on which you may need to spend more than this budget allocates, etc. The discrepancy in Headquarters rent is due to the length of time the office is rented for rather than higher rents.

B.

To effectively reach an electorate of 160,000 a candidate should plan to spend between \$.50 and \$1.00 per vote or \$80,000 to \$160,000. Admittedly a campaign can be run for less but unless you

Comments, Cont'd

are dealing with a highly educated or issue oriented electorate it would be difficult to win with a budget of less than \$50,000.

100-31100-100

PERCENT CAPACITY, ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS AND
SURPLUS OR DEFICIT SEATS

Building capacity is defined in the attached chart as all rooms in a building which could possibly be used as classrooms multiplied by 30 seats.

This definition erroneously translates into "classrooms," space which, in actuality, must be used for libraries, lunch rooms, study rooms, science laboratories, tutoring spaces and other special needs.

This definition, also, reflects temporary, demountables and substandard classroom space.

The term, "building capacity," does not take into account space needs determined by the Board of Education to be necessary for approved education programs.

TABLE VI

Percent Capacity, Elementary Schools and
Surplus or Deficit Seats

School	Enrollment March 2, 1972	Building** Capacity	% Capacity	Surplus or Deficit Seats
<u>Regular - Anacostia</u>				
Aiton	698	900	78	+102
Beers	851	900	95	+ 49
Benning & Annex	465	506	92	+ 41
Burrville	480	600	80	+120
Davis & Annex	969	1,130	86	+161
Drew & Annex	969	960	101	- 9
Garfield	831	980	85	+149
Harris	841	990	85	+149
Hendley & Hendley Annex No. 1	1,022	960	106	- 62
Friendship	540	660	82	+120
Houston	791	810	98	+ 19
Kenilworth	704	870	81	+166
Ketcham & Annex	1,185	1,140	104	- 45
Kimball	1,106	960	115	-146
Merritt	533	720	77	+187
Nalle	915	1,080	85	+165
Nichols Avenue	300	480	63	+180
Orr	425	390	109	- 35
Patterson	785	1,020	77	+191
Plummer	803	960	84	+157
Randle Highlands	566	460	123	-106
Richardson	705	1,140	62	+435

School	Enrollment March 2, 1972	Building** Capacity	% Capacity	Surplus or Deficit Seats
River Terrace	376	280	134	- 96
Shadd	890	960	93	+ 70
Simon	1,064	1,470	72	+406
Smothers	565	540	105	- 25
Stanton	1,277	1,710	75	+433
Thomas	702	1,020	69	+318
<u>Regular - Center City</u>				
Amidon	480	690	70	+210
Barnard	741	870	85	+129
Blow	493	960	51	+467
Bowen	483	690	70	+207
Brent	290	450	64	+160
Brightwood	661	774	85	+113
Brookland	203	360	56	+157
Bryan	665	810	82	+145
Buchanan	506	600	84	+ 94
Bunker Hill	909	950	96	+ 41
Burroughs	732	930	79	+198
Carver	258	240	108	- 18
Clark	611	720	85	+109
Cook, J. F.	409	540	76	+131
Crummell Annex	367	480	76	+113
Eckington	210	240	88	+ 30
Edmonds	146	240	61	+ 94

School	Enrollment March 2, 1972	Building Capacity	% Capacity	Surplus or Deficit Seats
Emery	856	960	89	+104
Gage	292	330	88	+ 32
Gibbs	697	990	70	+293
Giddings	342	570	60	+228
Goding	697	860	81	+163
Keene & Annex	654	750	87	+ 96
Kingsman	575	690	83	+115
Langdon	757	810	93	+ 53
Langston	159	240	66	+ 81
LaSalle	803	930	86	+127
Leckie	798	900	88	+102
Lenox	265	480	55	+215
Lewis	513	660	77	+147
Logan	488	870	56	+382
Lovejoy	513	600	86	+ 87
Ludlow-Taylor	761	840	91	+ 79
Madison	177	240	74	+ 63
Maury	390	510	76	+120
Miner	792	900	88	+102
Mott	548	750	73	+202
Noyes	414	660	63	+246
Payne	744	820	91	+ 76
Peabody	196	330	59	+134
Perry	81	330	25	+249
Petworth	467	540	86	+ 73
Powell	419	540	76	+121
Powell Annex	191	210	91	+ 19

School	Enrollment March 2, 1972	Building** Capacity	% Capacity	Surplus or Deficit Seats
Rudolph	934	960	97	+ 26
Shaed	474	809	59	+ 335
Shepherd	528	600	88	+ 72
Simmons	559	750	75	+ 191
Slater	228	240	95	+ 12
Slowe	656	810	81	+ 154
Stevens	173	360	48	+ 187
Sumner	133	300	44	+ 167
Syphax	505	660	77	+ 155
Takoma	485	540	90	+ 55
Thomson	396	540	73	+ 144
Truesdell	949	1,110	85	+ 161
Tyler	728	840	86	+ 112
Van Ness	488	720	68	+ 232
Walker Jones	582	750	78	+ 168
Watkins	651	1,140	57	+ 489
Weatherless	885	990	89	+ 105
Webb	745	1,096	68	+ 367
West	478	480	99	+ 2
Wheatley	677	1,050	64	+ 373
Whittier	1,042	1,080	96	+ 38
Wilson	768	810	95	+ 42
Woodridge	442	660	67	+ 218
Young	1,073	1,200	89	+ 127

School	Enrollment March 2, 1972	Building** Capacity	% Capacity	Surplus or Deficit Seats
<u>Regular - West of Park</u>				
Eaton	309	480	80	+ 94
Fillmore	171	240	71	+ 69
Hardy	146	300	49	+ 154
Hearst	179	300	60	+ 121
Hyde	189	240	79	+ 51
Janney	332	570	58	+ 238
Key	144	270	53	+ 126
Lafayette	606	720	84	+ 114
Mann	142	270	53	+ 128
Murch	535	600	89	+ 65
Oyster	225	300	97	+ 9
Stoddert	131	270	49	+ 139
<u>Model Schools</u>				
Bancroft	830	890	93	+ 60
Bruce	302	450	67	+ 148
Bundy	332	480	69	+ 148
Cleveland	256	510	50	+ 254
Cooke, H. D.	805	870	93	+ 65
Garrison	766	960	80	+ 194
Grimke	299	600	50	+ 301
Harrison	388	540	72	+ 152
Meyer	974	1,080	90	+ 106
Monroe	377	480	79	+ 103

School	Enrollment March 2, 1972	Building** Capacity	% Capacity	Surplus or Deficit Seats
Montgomery	453	490	92	+ 27
Parkview	803	960	84	+ 157
Raymond	925	960	96	+ 35
Seaton	625	840	74	+ 215
Tubman	892	960	93	+ 68
<u>Anacostia Project</u>				
Birney	936	1,060	88	+ 124
Congress Heights	986	1,380	71	+ 394
Draper	1,043	1,150	91	+ 107
Green	1,286	1,320	97	+ 34
McGogney	880	1,050	84	+ 170
McGogney Annex	444	600	73	+ 156
Moten	1,336	1,590	84	+ 254
Savoy & Annex	1,020	1,400	73	+ 380
Turner	1,008	1,140	88	+ 132
<u>Community Controlled Schools</u>				
Adams	440	600	73	+ 160
Morgan & Annex	556	720	77	+ 164

* Includes $\frac{1}{2}$ kindergarten and 1-6 only

** Includes permanent and temporary housing for regular students (1/2k plus 1-6)
excludes pre-k and special education classrooms

The Center Forum

A Publication of the Center for Urban Education

Vol. 3 No. 6

May 15, 1969

School Business II

Educational Audit: A Proposal

The landmark decision handed down by Judge Skelly Wright on June 19, 1967 in the *Hobson v. Hansen* school case in the District of Columbia turned on statistical evidence that measured among other things, assignment of teachers, expenditures per pupil, distribution of books and supplies, utilization of homogeneous ability grouping methods, and utilization of classroom space. When related to the color of the population and the economic level of the neighborhoods where schools are located, the data used in these measures showed definite patterns of racial and economic discrimination.

While Washington schools might be worse than most in the country, the patterns of discrimination are fairly typical of city schools wherever. Therefore the statistical charts opposite this page—which have been adopted by the Washington board of education in its efforts to acquire information upon which to base a report to the United States District Court on how the board intends to proceed to implement the Wright decision—are suggested as the forms and content which lay parent groups and organizations might adopt, at least initially, in their effort to gain an accounting of the quality of education in the large cities.

Although many city school systems assert they do not have these data, it is very likely that they do. The intelligence needed to administer large school systems requires officials, particularly those overseeing school finances, to have such information. In most states, these data are considered public information by law and can be obtained through legal procedures if necessary.

The writers suggest that parent groups and those outside the official school administrations cannot hope to understand what is measurably happening to their children without access to these forms of information. There are, of course, other problems—such as teacher attitudes and absenteeism—other immeasurable factors to be considered, the results of which undoubtedly show up in the children. But any attack on the deteriorating educational systems in large American cities must begin from factual bases.

The calculations involved in the gathering, analysis, and presentation of such data require skills no more exact than those required to do grocery store arithmetic.

Julius Hobson and Tina Lower

Julius Hobson is a member of the District of Columbia board of education and the plaintiff in *Hobson v. Hansen* (Forum July 5, 1967). Tina Lower is chairman of the Washington Institute for Quality Education.

nity relations long extolled by educational theorists are beginning to evolve, but not in the rather one-sided way assumed by the professional educator.) As the movement toward community control gains in strength, a wide variety of mechanisms will evolve for public discussions of school goals and effectiveness. One of these mechanisms will be detailed requests from community, teacher, and student groups for specific information on the schools and their operation. Both internal and external groups will demand what they wish to know in contrast to what the system has hitherto decided should be available.

Mr. Hobson's request for information is indeed specific, and even includes deadline dates. As a responsible public official, he wants some basic information about the Washington schools and he wants it fast, in a format that allows for rapid comparisons. Any large, urban school system will have offices devoted to compiling a variety of internal statistics and we would assume all of the requested in-

To: William R. Manning, Superintendent, D. C. Public Schools
From: Julius W. Hobson, Member, Board of Education
Subject: Implementation of the *Hobson v. Hansen* Decision — Data Requirements

In order to uphold the law in voting as a member of the District of Columbia Board of Education, it is essential to have before me the information outlined on the enclosed charts.

I am sure other members of the Board of Education will benefit from such information. Board members representing schools within specific Ward boundaries need some basis for comparison with other District schools. At-Large Board members, with an obligation to represent all students, parents and school employees under the law, have a broader interest in securing accurate and comprehensive facts particularly in light of recent statements in the press.

Procedure: Information must be supplied in an identical format to the charts enclosed. If your staff has problems understanding relationships, defining terms, selecting dates, etc., please ask them to call me before changing any word or column of a chart. I would be happy to provide your staff with an orientation to expedite the development of this information if further clarification becomes necessary.

The information requested provides nothing more than an elementary decision-making management tool, essential to a smooth-running organization, so I am sure it is readily available in your office. Narrative statements requested on individual charts should be limited to one or two sentences. If additional explanations are necessary, please enclose with appropriate chart. Ask your staff to prepare a supporting list of all source documents used in developing chart information. If further court action becomes necessary, this source reference, by chart, will substantiate the statistical records.

Priorities: The following list of charts, individually marked with due dates, should be delivered to each Board member on the date due. If your staff finds it impossible to meet the expected deadline, please provide the reasons in writing to me in advance of the due date. This city-wide data will assist Board members to comply with the court decision in voting on specific issues and agenda items.

- Chart A: D. C. School Experiments and Special Projects — FY 1969 — (Due Date 3/5/69)
- Chart B: D. C. Public Schools, Average Expenditure per Pupil — 1963, 1965, 1967, 1968 — (Due Date 3/5/69)
- Chart C: D. C. Public Schools, Essential Equipment Inventory — FY 1969 — (Due Date 3/19/69)
- Chart D: D. C. Public Schools — Curriculum Progress — (Due Date 3/19/69):
 - (1) English, School Years 1960-61; (2) History, 1966-67, 1967-68;
 - (3) Mathematics.
- Chart E: D. C. Public Schools — Curriculum Progress by Subject Areas — (Due Date 3/19/69): School Years 1960-61, 1966-67, 1967-68.
- Chart F: D. C. Public Schools — Books per Pupil, by School and Date of Publication — FY 1969 — (Due Date 3/19/69).

Confidentiality: Since public education in the District of Columbia is supported by public funds, statistical reports are a matter of public record. Upon request, these charts should be made available to all citizens—union, educational and civic organizations, parents, teachers and students. If we require administrators to administer without support, teachers to "produce" without equipment and students to learn without tools for learning, such facts should be made known to the public. These charts will also provide excellent data for discussion in Congressional hearings on the 1970 school budget and on other matters. In addition, it is my hope that these charts will serve as a forerunner to the development of a permanent annual "Report to the Taxpayers" from the elected Board of Education.

Budgeting for the 1970 Fiscal Year: The newly elected school board is responsible for voting the 1970 budget (covering the period July 1, 1969 to June 30, 1970). Charts A and B will provide significant information for a policy evaluation of the new budget. When these charts are prepared and submitted to the Board members, attach the latest draft copy of the proposed budget for review.

Continuing Needs for Evaluation: Several additional charts are being developed to cover such topics as (1) attendance, suspensions, drop-outs, (2) teacher certification and integration, (3) buildings and grounds, (4) adult education, (5) special summer school programs, and (6) vocational educational and job-training in non-vocational high schools. These charts will be discussed during future meetings.

We are clearly moving into an era when all persons associated with education will be held accountable for their decisions and their competence. (It is ironic that close school-commu-

formation is readily available. If it is not, or if it cannot be readily gathered, one can only question the competence of those offices and/or the fears associated with giving out data that, while public in every legal sense, is too often handled as sacred information available only to certain parties. A school board member, of all people, must be able to receive information quickly if he is to act based on knowledge. Any school system that cannot rapidly gather such fairly routine information needs to alter some of its procedures immediately.

The type of data herein outlined, in short, is clearly necessary but not sufficient to truly gauge a system's effectiveness. But it is a type of baseline information that must precede data that gets at the dynamics of programs. Indeed, it may be suggested that an anthropologist's skills may be necessary to truly get at the values and premises that cloud much of the operation of the schools. But since such specialists are in short supply, the best available numerical data is at least a start.

Of more importance than the data itself is the spirit and tone implicit in Mr. Hobson's memorandum. He makes it perfectly clear what he wants, why he wants it, and when he wants it. This type of demand is not frequently heard from school officials. And that is precisely one of the things wrong with many school systems. Too few individuals within them are truly concerned with quality education; of those few, even a lesser number can cope with the bureaucratic buck passing that often passes for decision

making. There are not enough persons who will demand that certain things must happen, and that they happen fast. The sense of urgency vital to bringing about change just does not seem to exist among enough school officials.

To make things happen necessitates some risks on the part of the instigator of the demands. Fortunately, school board members are reasonably safe from the invidious and subtle pressures that tend to keep an upstart in line within a bureaucracy. It is a good bet that Mr. Hobson's actions will be emulated by a growing number of persons concerned with the future of public education.

Richard Wisniewski

Richard Wisniewski is a post doctoral fellow at the Center for Urban Education and an assistant dean in the college of education at Wayne State University.

CHART A												EXPERIMENTS AND SPECIAL PROJECTS BY SCHOOL July 1, 1968 - June 30, 1969 (FY 69)												
Name of Project/Experiment	Schools Covered by Project	Number Students Covered by Project	Student Participation		Source of Funds						Duration of Project		Personnel Paid by Project				Salaries Paid by Project							
			Number Students Receiving Special Benefits Under Program	-- Not Received by all Students	FY 1969		FY 1970		Regular Budget Approved Amount	Side Funds	Regular Budget Proposed Amount	Side Funds	Beginning Date	Termination Date	Name of Project Director	Number of Non-Teaching Personnel	Number of Teaching Personnel	Name of Project Director	Number of Non-Teaching Personnel	Number of Teaching Personnel	Name of Project Director	Number of Non-Teaching Personnel	Number of Teaching Personnel	
SAMPLES																								
Developmental Reading																								

CHART B																
Name of School	1963				1965				1967				1968			
	Pupil Capacity	Enrollment	Total Budget	Average Expenditure Per Pupil	Pupil Capacity	Enrollment	Total Budget	Average Expenditure Per Pupil	Pupil Capacity	Enrollment	Total Budget	Average Expenditure Per Pupil	Pupil Capacity	Enrollment	Total Budget	Average Expenditure Per Pupil
*Expenditures per pupil based on the total budget -- including funds appropriated from Congress, Federal funds under NDEA, Impact Aid, special Title funds administered by OE (HEW), foundation funds, personal contributions and miscellaneous funds from all other sources.																

CHART C																	
Name of School	No. Film Proj.	No. Screen Proj.	No. Film Strip Proj.	No. Typewriters Elec. Std.	No. Xerox Mach.	No. Adding Mach.	No. Calcu-lators Mach.	No. Micro-scopes	No. Lang- uage Labs.	No. Elec. Sewing Mach.	No. Reading Mach.	No. Phono-graphs	No. Tape Recorders	No. Over-head Proj.	No. TV Sets	No. Radios	No. Printin (date & manuf.)
	*Equipment must be currently in operating condition to be counted. (Number of defective/inoperable equipment should be listed in () to the right of working number in each column.)																

CHART D																
CURRICULUM PROGRESS IN ENGLISH -- SCHOOL YEAR 1966-67																
Title and data of curriculum outline issued to teachers, city-wide ²			Authors of curriculum outline (names of teachers and supervisors)		Title of English course and type of literature studied				Names of textbooks recommended by curriculum outline				Additions to 1960 "Approved Textbook" list			
Basic (special academic) General Regular Honors			Basic (special academic) General Regular Honors													

CHART E																	
NAME OF SCHOOL		1960 - 61				1966 - 67				1967 - 68							
		Required Subjects		Elective Subjects		Required Subjects		Elective Subjects		Required Subjects		Elective Subjects					
Senior High, Vocational and Junior High Schools																	

CHART F																	
Name of School		**Total No. Students Date		Math. Texts Published through 12/31/63		History Texts Published through 12/31/63		Foreign Language Texts Published through 12/31/63		Reading Texts Published through 12/31/63		Literature Texts Published through 12/31/63		Composition and Grammar Texts Published through 12/31/63		Publ. after 1/1/64	
		Published after 1/1/64	Published after 1/1/64	Published after 1/1/64	Published after 1/1/64	Published after 1/1/64	Published after 1/1/64	Published after 1/1/64	Published after 1/1/64	Published after 1/1/64	Published after 1/1/64	Published after 1/1/64	Published after 1/1/64	Published after 1/1/64	Publ. after 1/1/64		

CHART G																
Name of School		*Total of bks. per Library			Library Personnel FY 1969				Equipment/Space FY 1969				Periodicals			
		1960	1966	1968	Names of full-time employees	Degree	Salary	No. of Pt.-time Assts.	Number Carrels	Phonographs and Earphones	Total Sq.Ft.	Other	Number Current Subscr.	No. Subscr. dating back '60 or earlier	Wk de:	
*In compiling information, use same base date for each year.																

MIN 4185
November 19, 1969

TO: District of Columbia Board of Education
FROM: Julius W. Hobson, Member
SUBJECT: The Tuition Grant Program of the District of Columbia Public Schools

At my request, the District of Columbia Public School Administration prepared a report from the Department of Special Education dealing with the Tuition Grant Program from 9/3/69 to 10/24/69.

This report deals with educational facilities for exceptional children from the District of Columbia. According to the report, 302 exceptional children were being served under the Special Tuition Grant Program as of the dates listed above. The total cost for serving these children was \$678,895 or an average expenditure per school year of about \$2,248 per child. The report submitted by the School Administration defined exceptional children as deaf, blind, and "emotional."

Calculations based on "The President's Report on the Mentally Retarded for the Fiscal Year 1969" show there were approximately 22,356 children between the ages of 5 and 17 in the District of Columbia who were considered exceptional in the following categories:

Mentally retarded	10,710
Speech	5,355
Emotional	3,060
Special learning disability	1,533
Hearing	778
Other, cripple, etc.	767
Blind	153
	<hr/>
	22,356

In the fiscal year 1969, further estimates based on the President's Committee on Mental Retardation indicated that only 2,500 of these children were being served by the D.C. Public School facilities. The report, prepared by the Division of Special Education regarding tuition grants, adds 302 children to this total thus leaving 19,554 children or 87.5% of the exceptional children without any public assistance or without any opportunity for public education. This information is corroborated by the "Annual Report of the District of Columbia Public Schools for 1967-68" which lists 21,600 exceptional children of school age in this period but only 10% (or 2,139 children) as being served by Public School facilities.

My analysis of the Administration's report presented in the attached table reveals the following:

1. That at best this report, on its face, indicates rank discrimination against 87.5% of the exceptional children in the District of Columbia who are not being served by the District's Public School system.

2. Upon checking with some of the schools listed in the report as having facilities to serve "emotional" children, it was found (and the schools so stated) that they were not designed to deal with children having "emotional" problems and have no staff or facilities for such purposes.

3. Upon checking with the schools involved as to the number of children enrolled and the size of their tuition grants, the report of the School Administration proved inaccurate. The report frequently indicated there were children present in these school which the schools do not have enrolled. The schools indicated there were children enrolled who were not listed in the report.

4. The report brings up the very important question of how children are selected to receive tuition grants, how the schools they attend under grants are chosen and how long the grants last.

A further analysis of the attached table -- entitled District of Columbia Public Schools Department of Special Education, Tuition Grants for Children with "Emotional" Difficulties by Income Levels -- indicates that again the School Administration favors the more affluent in their selection process. Tuition grants for the more affluent in the "emotional" category are clearly larger in dollar value and more numerous than those made available to the poor. The report also indicates that there is discrimination in the kind of treatment the School Administration feels should be made available to the children of the more affluent with "emotional" problems. It is clear that the tuition grant program is in direct violation of the "Skelly Wright Decision of 1967" which prohibits such economic discrimination.

No intelligent justification can be put forward for the continuation of economic discrimination in the Tuition Grant Program. The funds for this program are made available in the regular Budget. The Department of Special Education cannot possibly justify any amount for this type of program in the face of its inaccurate, distorted reporting. And, therefore, the Board of Education has no way of checking the accuracy of the line item budget requests for tuition grants.

I recommend that the Board of Education order the suspension of new tuition grants until such time as the Department of Special Education can produce an accurate report as to the numbers of children active in these programs and the amount of money spent in their behalf. In addition, new grants should not be given until such time as the Department of Special Education can explain, to the satisfaction of all, that its selection procedures are fair and its assistance is available to all needy exceptional children regardless of economic class.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DEPARTMENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
TUITION GRANTS FOR CHILDREN WITH
EMOTIONAL DIFFICULTIES - BY INCOME LEVEL

Two cases #35 and #47 not charted due to inaccurate address

NOTE: ED - Educational Disability

TOTAL NO. GRANTEES **TOTAL GRANT AMOUNTS** **AT GRANT AWARDED**



HOBSON V. HANSEN: JUDICIAL SUPERVISION OF THE COLOR-BLIND SCHOOL BOARD

The opinion of Judge J. Skelly Wright¹ in *Hobson v. Hansen*² may presage a period of increased judicial scrutiny of educational policies which, although nondiscriminatory³ in form and purpose, nevertheless fail to respond adequately to the educational needs of Negroes and other disadvantaged minorities. After closely examining the school system of the District of Columbia, the *Hobson* court provides remedies for a variety of educational ills. It orders the school board to reduce de facto segregation, to institute compensatory programs, and to abolish a "tracking" system which placed school children who did poorly on aptitude tests in a "slow" curriculum. These results are made possible by the court's adoption of a strict standard of review. The court holds that educational policies must be subjected to a thorough search for justification whenever they adversely affect a disadvantaged minority, regardless of their nondiscriminatory intent. This Note will analyze the constitutional basis for the court's standard of review, discuss the court's application of the standard to the facts of *Hobson*, and assess the merits of its general approach.

I. THE "OVERRIDING JUSTIFICATION" STANDARD OF REVIEW

The equal protection clause⁴ does not prevent the government from classifying persons into categories which will be accorded differential treatment, provided that the classifications created can be justified. Some types of classification must be supported by very strong justification. Racial classifications have been regarded with suspicion by the courts, and unless the government presents compelling reasons—for example, a wartime emergency⁵—for the imposition of inequalities on the basis of race, such classifications will be invalidated. The government has also been required to present strong justification for discriminatory classifications based on other "suspect traits" such as

¹ Judge Wright, a Circuit Judge for the D.C. Circuit, was sitting as District Judge by designation pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 291(c) (1964).

² 269 F. Supp. 401 (D.D.C. 1967).

³ "Discrimination" is used in this Note to indicate the use of classifications based on "suspect traits." A "discriminatory" school board policy is one which intentionally classifies students for unequal treatment on the basis of race, economic class, nationality, or other similar traits. For example, if a school board gerrymanders school districts for the purpose of creating racial separation, it has made a "discriminatory" racial classification. *Cf. Clemons v. Board of Educ.*, 228 F.2d 853 (6th Cir.), cert. denied, 350 U.S. 1006 (1956). However, if a non-racially motivated school board assigns pupils to neighborhood schools on the basis of geographic criteria, it has not "discriminated" even if its neighborhood school policy adversely affects Negroes by producing racial segregation.

⁴ Although the equal protection clause does not in terms apply to the District of Columbia, the *Hobson* court concludes that under *Bolling v. Sharpe*, 347 U.S. 497 (1954) (abolishing de jure segregation in the District), "the equal protection clause in its application to public school education" is "in its full sweep a component of due process." 269 F. Supp. at 493.

⁵ See *Korematsu v. United States*, 323 U.S. 214 (1944) (Japanese Relocation Cases).

alienage, nationality, or economic status.⁶ In such cases the courts appear to have applied a balancing test and to have struck down classifications which failed to produce societal benefits outweighing the detriments imposed on the affected class.⁷

A more relaxed standard of review has been applied to classifications which do not single out individuals for differential treatment on the basis of "suspect traits." When dealing with state economic regulations, courts have usually upheld governmental classifications if, they could find a rational relationship between the classification and the accomplishment of a permissible public purpose.⁸ In this area, "equal" has come to mean "equal unless a fairly tenable reason exists for inequality."⁹ When dealing with statutes affecting civil rights or personal liberties, the courts have generally been less permissive, albeit without always clearly articulating a standard of review stricter than the "rational relationship" standard.¹⁰ In some cases, notably those dealing with the rights of criminal defendants and voters,¹¹ the states have been required to support inequality-producing classifications with substantial, rather than merely tenable, justification; classifications have been invalidated which were not completely irrational but merely "harsh and inessential."¹² However, most courts have been lenient in dealing with classifications affecting educational rights; school boards have been given wide latitude so long as their policies remain untainted by racial motivation.¹³

The standard of review applied by the *Hobson* court is similar to the standard generally applied to "suspect trait" or "discriminatory" classifications. However, *Hobson* applies this standard to classifica-

⁶ See, e.g., *Takahashi v. Fish & Game Comm'n*, 334 U.S. 410 (1948); *Tussman & tenBroek, The Equal Protection of the Laws*, 37 CALIF. L. REV. 341, 353-61 (1949).

⁷ See Note, *Equal Protection and the Indigent Defendant: Griffin and Its Progeny*, 16 STAN. L. REV. 394, 399 (1964).

⁸ See, e.g., *Tigner v. Texas*, 310 U.S. 141 (1940); Note, *Discriminations Against the Poor and the Fourteenth Amendment*, 81 HARV. L. REV. 435, 437 (1967). See generally *Tussman & tenBroek, supra* note 6.

⁹ *Black, The Lawfulness of the Segregation Decisions*, 69 YALE L.J. 421, 422 (1960).

¹⁰ However, in *Harper v. Virginia Bd. of Elections*, 383 U.S. 663, 670 (1966), the Court stated that "where fundamental rights and liberties are asserted under the Equal Protection Clause, classifications which might invade or restrain them must be closely scrutinized and carefully confined." Mr. Justice Harlan, dissenting, argued that non-racial classifications should be upheld if they have a rational basis. *Id.* at 681, 683 & n.5.

¹¹ See, e.g., *Harper v. Virginia Bd. of Elections*, 383 U.S. 663 (1966); *Carrrington v. Rash*, 380 U.S. 89 (1965); *Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 533 (1964); *Griffin v. Illinois*, 351 U.S. 12 (1956). Cf. *Skinner v. Oklahoma ex rel. Williamson*, 316 U.S. 535 (1942) (sterilization under an habitual criminal statute).

¹² See *Van Alstyne, Student Academic Freedom and the Rule-Making Powers of Public Universities: Some Constitutional Considerations*, 2 LAW IN TRANS. Q. 1, 28 (1965).

¹³ See, e.g., *Deal v. Cincinnati Bd. of Educ.*, 369 F.2d 55 (6th Cir. 1966), cert. denied, 389 U.S. 847 (1967); *Downs v. Board of Educ.*, 336 F.2d 988 (10th Cir. 1964), cert. denied, 380 U.S. 914 (1965); *Bell v. School City*, 324 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1963), cert. denied, 377 U.S. 924 (1964). But see *Barksdale v. Springfield School Comm.*, 237 F. Supp. 543 (D. Mass.), vacated, 348 F.2d 261 (1st Cir. 1965); *Blocker v. Board of Educ.*, 226 F. Supp. 208, remedy considered on rehearing, 229 F. Supp. 709 (E.D.N.Y. 1964); *Banche v. Board of Educ.*, 204 F. Supp. 150 (E.D.N.Y. 1962) (on motion for summary judgment).

tions which are neither discriminatory on their face nor the product of a covertly discriminatory scheme, but which merely "adversely affect" the educational opportunity of disadvantaged minorities. *Hobson* indicates that such classifications, if they are to be upheld, must produce benefits which in the judgment of the reviewing court are of sufficient magnitude to override their detrimental effects.¹⁴ This standard of review gives the court wide latitude in balancing the benefits of competing nondiscriminatory educational policies.

Although the *Hobson* court draws on discriminatory classification cases as examples of special judicial concern for minority groups, it relies primarily on a series of cases in which the Supreme Court closely scrutinized the underlying justification of statutes invading "critical personal rights."¹⁵ Like *Hobson*, these cases dealt with governmental classifications not based on race, alienage, or other "suspect traits." Although the cases cited do not articulate the balancing test used by the *Hobson* court, they do utilize a standard which is more exacting than the "reasonable relationship" standard. The *Hobson* court reasons that these cases exemplify judicial willingness to intervene when important personal rights are at stake, and that judicial intervention is doubly justified when its purpose is to redeem the rights of a "disadvantaged minority."

None of the "critical right" cases cited by the court involved the right to an equal opportunity for education. In *Carrington v. Rash*,¹⁶ *Reynolds v. Sims*,¹⁷ and *Harper v. Virginia Board of Elections*,¹⁸ the Supreme Court invalidated statutes unequally affecting the right to vote. These three cases are not directly apposite, since the right to vote is the "preservative of other basic civil and political rights"¹⁹ and thus may need a greater degree of judicial protection than educational rights. *Griffin v. Illinois*²⁰ involved a state's denial of a free trial transcript to indigent defendants. *Griffin*'s applicability to education is doubtful; courts have traditionally exercised a close scrutiny of practices unequally affecting criminal defendants, and judges are expert in identifying and weighing the interests involved. Furthermore, the *Griffin* court may have been influenced by the especially harsh consequences—denial of effective appellate review—to which the requirement of a payment subjected indigent criminal defendants.

Despite a lack of direct precedent, the *Hobson* position has appeal, at least in its abstract form. Opportunity for education seems to fall readily into the category of "critical rights"; it is of signal importance

¹⁴ See 269 F. Supp. at 507 n.197, where the court indicates that the standard to be applied in *Hobson* is similar to the standard applied in Supreme Court discriminatory classification cases in which overriding justification was required. Elsewhere the court states that its duty is to determine whether the virtues stemming from the neighborhood school policy are "compelling or adequate justification" for the policy's adverse effect on Negroes. *Id.* at 508.

¹⁵ See cases cited note 11 *supra*. The "critical rights" doctrine is discussed in Horowitz, *Unseparate but Unequal—The Emerging Fourteenth Amendment Issue in Public School Education*, 13 U.C.L.A. REV. 1147, 1155-66 (1966).

¹⁶ 380 U.S. 89 (1965).

¹⁷ 377 U.S. 533 (1964).

¹⁸ 383 U.S. 663 (1966).

¹⁹ *Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 533, 562 (1964).

²⁰ 351 U.S. 12 (1956).

to minority groups as a means of social advancement.²¹ Furthermore, it seems anomalous that racially discriminatory policies can be successfully challenged while the equally harmful policies of a school board which is merely bungling—or which has an attitude of indifference toward the racial consequences of its policies—are immune from review, except perhaps under the extremely permissive “rationality” standard.

However, whatever its appeal as an abstract proposition, the validity of the *Hobson* doctrine largely depends upon the institutional competence of the judiciary to exercise broad review over education and other potential “critical rights.” The constitutional principles announced by the court can best be assessed by considering the court’s application of the principles to the case before it and then examining the implications of the decision.

II. APPLICATION OF THE “OVERRIDING JUSTIFICATION” STANDARD TO THE FACTS BEFORE THE COURT²²

A. *De Facto* Segregation

The District of Columbia school authorities followed a neighborhood school policy under which students were assigned to schools near their homes. In eleven of the seventeen schools in the predominantly white western section of the District, 85 to 100 percent of the students enrolled were white. In the remainder of the District, 139 of the 156 schools had a Negro enrollment of at least 85 percent. The student enrollment throughout the entire District was 90.2 percent Negro.²³

The court applies its “overriding justification” standard to this

²¹ “Today, education is perhaps the most important function of state and local governments. . . . [I]t is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education.” *Brown v. Board of Educ.*, 347 U.S. 483, 493 (1954). Apart from its emphasis upon the importance of education, *Brown* has little relevance in determining the standard of review to be used in *de facto* segregation cases. Even if *Brown* is based upon “the equal-educational-opportunity principle,” Fiss, *Racial Imbalance in the Public Schools: The Constitutional Concepts*, 78 HARV. L. REV. 564, 588-98 (1965), rather than the notion that racial classifications are inherently arbitrary and therefore must be struck down regardless of whether they produce inequality, see Kaplan, *Segregation Litigation and the Schools—Part II: The General Northern Problem*, 58 NW. U.L. REV. 157, 173 (1963), *Brown* provides no guidance with regard to the standard of review to be used in implementing the “equal-educational-opportunity principle” when a governmental classification *not* based on race nevertheless “adversely affects” Negroes. The principle that racial classifications are subject to closer scrutiny than classifications based on other grounds was well established before *Brown*, see Tussman & tenBroek, *supra* note 6, at 356, and nothing in *Brown* is inconsistent with the notion that non-racial classifications affecting educational opportunity are subject to review only under the “rational relationship” standard.

²² This section omits discussion of two areas in which the court discovered *de jure* segregation. The court found that a racially motivated policy had produced teacher segregation. 269 F. Supp. at 501. Also, the optional attendance zones which existed in some areas were the product of a racially motivated policy designed to allow white students to escape from predominantly Negro schools. *Id.* at 499-500. However, although the school board had an attitude of “affirmative satisfaction” with the segregation spawned by the neighborhood school policy, it did not possess an “actual intent” to discriminate racially. *Id.* at 503.

²³ *Id.* at 410-12.

factual situation by weighing the benefits of neighborhood schools against the detriment to the educational opportunity of Negroes produced by segregation. The court finds that the government classification used — assignment of pupils according to geographic criteria — bears a rational relationship to the accomplishment of desirable objectives, such as the minimization of transportation difficulties. However, these benefits do not outweigh, in the court's estimation, the detriments produced by segregation: Negro children are forced to attend predominantly Negro schools, where they suffer from associational deprivation and stigma. The court concludes that although the neighborhood school policy need not be completely abandoned, it must be altered to provide a greater degree of integration.²⁴

The court's conclusion is based on its finding of fact that "a Negro student in a predominantly Negro school gets a formal education inferior to the academic education he would receive . . . in a school which is integrated or predominantly white."²⁵ This conclusion was supported by expert testimony at trial, and it was conceded by Dr. Hansen, the only defendant to testify on the point.²⁶ Viewed as a finding of fact made by a judge constrained to consider only the evidence presented by the parties, it cannot be said to be erroneous. However, there is in fact a serious question whether racial separation, by itself, produces deleterious effects upon the educational performance of Negroes. The *Coleman Report*,²⁷ a major study published under the auspices of the United States Office of Education, concludes that a school's racial composition per se has little effect upon the educational achievement of Negro students. The *Coleman Report* indicates that Negro students do best when placed in a school containing students with high educational aspirations and family backgrounds strongly supportive of education, regardless of the racial composition of the school.²⁸ Aspirations and family background need not always correlate with race; economic class is probably a more reliable indicator.²⁹ If this is so, Negroes attending a middle-class Negro school suffer no educational detriment from *de facto* segregation; furthermore, integration of poor Negroes and poor whites would produce little or no

²⁴ The dimensions of the court's final remedy are not defined in its opinion, but its immediate remedy aims at limited integration instead of proportionate distribution of Negroes and whites in the schools. The court has ordered the school board to draw up and submit a plan to alleviate segregation, and has specified that the plan consider such alternatives as educational parks and pupil pairing. Pending the implementation of such a plan, it has ordered the bussing of volunteer Negro schoolchildren from overcrowded Negro schools to white schools operating at less than capacity. The bussing order will affect fewer than 1000 Negro students, and the white schools to which these students will be bussed contain about 3000 pupils. *Id.* at 509.

²⁵ *Id.* at 419.

²⁶ *Id.* at 419-20.

²⁷ U.S. DEPT' OF HEALTH, EDUC. & WELFARE, OFFICE OF EDUCATION, EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY (1966) [hereinafter cited as COLEMAN REPORT].

²⁸ COLEMAN REPORT 307-310. The *Coleman Report*'s analysis is criticized in U.S. COMM'N ON CIVIL RIGHTS, RACIAL ISOLATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS, app. C-1, at 35-47 (1967) [hereinafter cited as RACIAL ISOLATION]. *Racial Isolation* maintains that the racial composition of a school has an independent effect upon student achievement. *See id.*, app. C-1, at 41. *See generally id.* at 73-114.

²⁹ *See* Kaplan, *supra* note 21, at 197, 202-03.

educational benefit. Thus, integration by class instead of race would be the proper antidote for educational detriments caused by associational deprivation.

This issue is of little practical importance in the District of Columbia, where there is a close correlation between economic status and race.³⁰ However, in cities with a large poor white population, the issue will be of great significance to a court seeking to achieve beneficial educational results. Of course, a court applying the *Hobson* approach might order racial integration even if the educational benefits of integration were doubtful. The court might find that segregation harmed Negroes by reducing their ability to compete in white society or by furthering racial discord. The *Hobson* court alludes to these effects, but its holding rests primarily on the ground of harm to educational performance. The existence of sharply conflicting sociological evidence on this point does not promote confidence in the *Hobson* approach; before a court makes a decision forcing sizable policy readjustments by other branches of government, it should be clear as to the objective it seeks to achieve, and certain that the sociological evidence available strongly supports requiring such an adjustment.

The court does not discuss another educational issue: whether, with limited resources available, the school board should concentrate upon achieving integration or upon providing compensatory programs for culturally handicapped children.³¹ The court orders the school board to undertake both, and it is difficult to determine at this point which it considers more important. Perhaps the court's requirement that the school board consider several comprehensive plans for integration³² indicates that integration, insofar as it is possible within the District, will have first priority. Eventually, the court will have to make some judgment of priorities, either by approval of a plan submitted by the school board or in some other manner.

B. Unequal Allocation of Resources

Even after de facto segregation is reduced to the extent practicable, most of the schools in the District will remain predominantly Negro. The court recognizes the futility of attempting to achieve substantial racial balance in the District's school system, and it searches for other ways to equalize educational opportunity. The court discovered that the District's Negro schools were inferior to its white schools. The buildings were older and overcrowded; the teachers had poorer qualifications; the median per pupil expenditure was less. The court holds:³³

[I]f whites and Negroes, or rich and poor, are to be consigned to separate schools, pursuant to whatever policy, the minimum the Constitution

³⁰ See 269 F. Supp. at 451-52. Although a general correlation between race and poverty prevails in the District, two of its junior high schools with Negro enrollments of 95% and 98% are located in neighborhoods with a median income of approximately \$8,500. *Id.* at 452.

³¹ The case for compensatory education is argued in Alsop, *No More Non-sense About Ghetto Education!*, THE NEW REPUBLIC, July 22, 1967, at 18. But see RACIAL ISOLATION 128-40.

³² See note 24 *supra*.

³³ 269 F. Supp. at 496.

will require . . . is that for their objectively measurable aspects these schools be run on the basis of real equality, at least unless any inequalities are adequately justified.

The doctrine enunciated in this part of the opinion is mainly hortatory; nothing in the decree turns on it.³⁴ The school board had already embarked upon a construction program to correct inequalities in building facilities, and the court does not order an additional remedy. The inequalities in per pupil expenditure seem to have been due largely to the lower salaries paid to inexperienced Negro teachers working in predominantly Negro schools. The court orders teacher integration under another constitutional theory,³⁵ and it decides to wait until after integration is accomplished before determining whether additional action is necessary.

Although the court's remedy may prove flexible, the general rule which it lays down is disturbingly mechanical. In requiring that the "objectively measurable aspects" of the schools be equal, the court apparently assumes that inferior physical facilities are harmful to the educational opportunity of schoolchildren. The *Coleman Report*, however, concludes that physical facilities have very little effect on educational performance.³⁶ Of course, inferior physical facilities represent a denial of equal treatment, whatever their effect upon education, if they provide inferior recreational opportunities or if they are less safe and comfortable. However, it is doubtful whether these interests represent "critical rights" which, under the court's basic theory, justify a broader standard of review. Perhaps the court, if presented with evidence that inferior physical facilities have little effect upon education, would accept the need to employ resources in ways other than construction as an "adequate justification" for unequal facilities. But the court's presumption that inferior physical facilities are harmful to educational performance may lend inflexibility to judicial attempts to aid disadvantaged children, and may result in overemphasis upon the correction of physical inequalities.

C. Compensatory Programs

Recognizing that equalization of resources still leaves schools suffering under *de facto* segregation at an educational disadvantage, the court, in an unexplained sentence in the portion of its opinion styled "Remedy," states that it will require "compensatory education sufficient at least to overcome the detriment of [de facto] segregation" to be provided in "certain areas, particularly the slums" where children are denied the benefits of an integrated education.³⁷ This requirement probably contemplates the expenditure of unequal sums of money for the purpose of obtaining more equal results,³⁸ and it illustrates the

³⁴ However, the court suggests that its equal allocation doctrine adds support to its bussing requirement. *Id.* at 498.

³⁵ See note 22 *supra*.

³⁶ COLEMAN REPORT 22, 312-16.

³⁷ 269 F. Supp. at 515.

³⁸ One recent field study has cast doubt upon the possibility of overcoming the handicaps under which children in segregated schools operate even with a

court's expansive concept of equal treatment. The court's requirement of equal treatment is not satisfied if the school board ends *de facto* segregation to the extent practicable and then spends an equal amount of time, money, and effort upon each student. The state must act affirmatively to aid children who are harmed by racial imbalance, even if the imbalance is unavoidable,³⁹ by expending additional resources to improve their educational opportunity.

D. Ability Grouping

Nearly all of the District's schools utilized an "ability grouping" system under which students were placed in one of three or four "tracks." The tracking system was designed to cope with the problem of a single curriculum which was too slow for gifted children and too demanding for others.⁴⁰ Proponents of the track system asserted that when a teacher must deal in one classroom with students of widely varying ability levels, he is forced to aim at the middle-level student and neglect the extremes. The gifted student is not challenged; he becomes bored and his intellectual potential is wasted. At the same time, the slow student is forced to struggle through a curriculum which he does not understand, and he becomes frustrated, isolated, and depressed. To meet these problems, track theory called for a separation of children on the basis of their capacity to learn, with different ability groups receiving instruction of varying degrees of difficulty.⁴¹

The tracking decision was made early in a child's education: track division began in the fourth grade for most children, and some retarded children were placed in the lowest track as early as the first grade. Nationally standardized aptitude tests were crucial in determining track placement, although achievement tests and teachers' eval-

well-planned compensatory program. *See RACIAL ISOLATION 115-40.* Any plan which did succeed would probably involve the expenditure of substantial additional sums on slum schools; New York's "More Effective Schools" plan, which is reported to have enabled many ghetto children to perform at grade-level or above, involved the expenditure of \$430 per pupil above the normal outlay. *See Alsop, supra note 31, at 21.*

³⁹ Unlike previous courts which have ordered school boards to undertake compensatory programs, *see* Rousset, *Achieving Equal Educational Opportunity for Negroes in the Public Schools of the North and West: The Emerging Role for Private Constitutional Litigation*, 35 GEO. WASH. L. REV. 698, 717-18 (1967), the *Hobson* court does not attempt to link its compensatory education requirement to inequalities stemming from denial of equal opportunity in the past. Nor does it limit its requirement to compensation for detriments caused by *de facto* segregation which, although constitutional under the "overriding justification" standard, would nevertheless be correctable with sufficient effort; the *Hobson* remedy apparently requires compensation for the harmful effects of unavoidable imbalance as well. At least so long as some schools exist which provide the benefits of integrated education to their students, the school board must compensate for the stigmatizing effect of segregation in those schools which remain racially imbalanced, despite the fact that the overall composition of the school population (90.2% Negro in the District) makes it impossible to provide integrated education for all. The court does not reach the question of whether programs to compensate for the harmful effects of racial imbalance would be required even if no schools existed which provided an integrated, and therefore superior, educational experience for some children.

⁴⁰ *See* C. HANSEN, *THE FOUR-TRACK CURRICULUM IN TODAY'S HIGH SCHOOLS* 7, 11-18 (1964).

⁴¹ *See id. passim*; 269 F. Supp. at 444-45.

uations were also considered. The curriculum in the lower tracks was tailored for a "blue-collar" education, and few students were allowed to take courses outside their own tracks. Furthermore, although track theory envisaged the continual re-evaluation of students and movement from track to track, in practice the system became quite rigid: the initial track placement was likely to be permanent. Although remedial programs were offered to students in the lower tracks, they were of limited scope and did not succeed in upgrading many of the students enrolled. Children placed in one of the two lower tracks had little chance to qualify for college.

The court's inquiry was triggered by the fact that track enrollment correlated with socio-economic status and race: a relatively large percentage of lower-class Negro schoolchildren were enrolled in the lower tracks, while middle-class white children were statistically overrepresented in the upper tracks. The court found, largely on the basis of expert testimony, that this disparity resulted from the use of aptitude tests which were "culturally biased." The tests were standardized on a sampling of the national population, which is largely white and middle-class, and they utilized language forms and vocabularies alien to lower-class Negro children. Furthermore, lower-class Negro children were more likely to be handicapped by apathy and "test anxiety" than were middle-class white children. Thus, instead of being classified according to "capacity to learn,"⁴² students were "in reality being classified according to their socio-economic or racial status, or — more precisely — according to environmental and psychological factors which have nothing to do with innate ability."⁴³

In dealing with the tracking system the court speaks mainly in terms of the "rational relationship" test. It assumes arguendo that ability grouping, if based on tests accurately measuring innate ability, "can be reasonably related to the purposes of public education."⁴⁴ However, because the cultural bias of the tests used for tracking resulted in the placement of children who were not innately stupid into the lower tracks, the classifications made by the tracking system were "irrational."⁴⁵ Despite this language, however, the court seems to apply a standard less permissive than the rationality test. The aptitude tests might properly have been termed "irrational" had their cultural bias been purely arbitrary — for example, had they required knowledge of a fairy tale known to one ethnic group but not to another. However, it is apparent from the court's findings that the tests, while

⁴² The court distinguishes "capacity to learn" from "present ability." 269 F. Supp. at 512 n.206. "Present ability" is not precisely defined, but it appears to refer to a student's present scholastic skill as limited by his cultural handicaps, while "capacity to learn" is a concept similar to "innate ability." In theory, the tracking system sought to separate students on the basis of "capacity to learn" so that they would be able to "progress as fast and as far as possible according to their innate capacity to learn." *Id.*

⁴³ *Id.* at 514. Although this quotation, taken out of context, seems to imply that the school board had made a discriminatory classification, elsewhere the court explicitly says that the evidence does not sustain a finding that the school board used the tracking system intentionally to discriminate against Negroes. *Id.* at 512, n.208.

⁴⁴ *Id.* at 512.

⁴⁵ *Id.* at 513.

not measuring innate ability, do measure factors which are relevant to a student's academic performance. A test which measures present ability to read, understanding of the middle-class vocabulary in which textbooks are in fact written, and enthusiasm for school subjects has some predictive validity in determining whether a student has the type of "ability to learn" which will enable him to succeed in an advanced curriculum.⁴⁶ A school board with limited resources could rationally conclude that tracking based on the tests was the most efficient way to fulfill the educational needs of modern society: it singles out students who are most easily educable and offers them an enriched curriculum. Thus, a court animated by the permissive spirit of the "rational relationship" standard would probably allow the tracking system to stand. The *Hobson* court implicitly applies its balancing test, and concludes that the benefits derived from the system do not outweigh the detriments imposed on disadvantaged children.⁴⁷

The court's opinion may leave open the possibility of using some forms of separation based on aptitude tests. The court does not seem directly to dispute the school board's assertion that children who do poorly on aptitude tests will suffer if placed in heterogeneous classes and subjected to a curriculum geared to the average child. Of course, it can be argued that lower-track children would benefit from association with upper-track children and thereby improve their educational performance.⁴⁸ But the court, in condemning the track system, does not place primary emphasis upon the fact that the system partially deprived lower-track children of the society of upper-track children. Instead, the court emphasizes the diluted "blue-collar" education received by lower-track children, as well as the absence of cross-tracking, the early age at which placement was made, and the practical irreversability of the initial placement decision.⁴⁹ This emphasis suggests that the court might accept a more flexible tracking system if adequate

⁴⁶ Cf. Anastasi, *Some Implications of Cultural Factors for Test Construction*, in *TESTING PROBLEMS IN PERSPECTIVE* 453, 456 (A. Anastasi ed. 1966).

⁴⁷ At places the court hints that it is applying a standard stricter than the rationality test to the tracking system. See 269 F. Supp. at 513 n.211; *id.* at 511 n.205.

⁴⁸ Such an argument would have to rest upon an empirical basis different from that supporting the court's finding that *de facto* school segregation results in inferior education for Negro students. Students have some opportunity to associate under the tracking system; for a number of non-academic activities which take place during the school day, there is no separation. Furthermore, it is unlikely that tracking substantially decreases the opportunity for beneficial interracial association in most of the District schools. A large majority of the schools in the District will remain predominantly Negro even after *de facto* segregation is reduced to the extent practicable, and evidence adduced by the parties in *Hobson* tended to show that when a school contains a Negro population of 85% or more "the educational and social advantages attached to integration disappear." *Id.* at 411 n.9. Perhaps tracking separation could still be condemned on the ground that deprivation of association with children of a higher economic class is harmful, but the *Hobson* court did not make such a finding.

⁴⁹ See *id.* at 512 (track system results in physical separation, but "[m]ore importantly, each track offers a substantially different kind of education, both in place of learning and in scope of subject matter"); *id.* at 515 (any ability grouping system which, through failure to implement compensatory programs or otherwise, fails to bring the great majority of children into the mainstream of public education denies equal educational opportunity).

compensatory programs were instituted which resulted in successful upgrading.

This interpretation of the court's opinion is weakened by language in the decree which seems to order the unconditional abolition of the system instead of its reformation,⁵⁰ and by language in the opinion indicating that separation is one of the evils produced by the track system.⁵¹ If the court intends to abolish ability grouping altogether, it can be criticized for making the assumption — not adequately supported by the evidence⁵² — that heterogeneous classes will provide the best possible education for lower-track children, and for failing to weigh detriments to upper-track children against benefits to lower-track children.

On balance, the *Hobson* decision probably permits educators to retain a modified version of the tracking system on condition that adequate compensatory programs be instituted. Moreover, even if a school system does not employ tracking, a faithful application of the principles developed by the court may still require that the system institute special programs aimed at overcoming cultural handicaps. The court's basic objection to the tracking system is that it takes children's cultural handicaps as immutable and shunts children with background deficiencies into a "watered-down" curriculum which fails to overcome these handicaps. The court states that "any system of ability grouping which . . . fails in fact to bring the majority of children into the mainstream of education denies the children excluded equal educational opportunity and thus encounters the constitutional bar."⁵³ But what of systems not involving grouping which "fail in fact" to bring ghetto children into the mainstream of education? Even in heterogeneous classes, the child who suffers from apathy and anxiety, and who has severe background deficiencies — elements which the *Hobson* court found were identified by the tests — may receive an inferior education because he is handicapped by the very traits which the court considered irrelevant for tracking purposes. Unless the court's doctrine requires a finding that children have been treated differently in some physical sense — such as by being taught in separate classrooms — a heterogeneous system seems equally susceptible to judicial condemnation. A fair implication of the court's reasoning seems to be that any system

⁵⁰ The court says that "the track system simply must be abolished," *id.* at 515, and decrees that the school board be "permanently enjoined from operating the track system in the District of Columbia public schools." *Id.* at 517.

In compliance with the *Hobson* decree, the school authorities in the District have abandoned the practice of tracking on the basis of standardized tests. At the elementary school level, heterogeneous classes now generally prevail. Children who were previously placed in the "Special Academic" track (IQ 75 or below) are now taught with other children. These children also receive "individual attention" in some academic or "skill" subjects such as arithmetic and reading. At higher school levels, admission to classes teaching advanced subjects is predicated upon a student's ability to qualify by having passed prerequisite courses, rather than upon his performance on aptitude tests. Telephone Conversation with Mr. Leroy Dillard, Principal of Goding Elementary School, on Assignment in Office of Deputy Superintendent of Schools for Implementation of the *Hobson* Decree, Feb. 29, 1968.

⁵¹ See 269 F. Supp. at 443.

⁵² See note 49 *supra*.

⁵³ 269 F. Supp. at 515.

which allows some children to achieve at a level commensurate to their innate potential while denying this opportunity to others is invalid unless the school board can present adequate justification for the status quo. Perhaps *Hobson*'s concept of equal educational opportunity requires that school boards strive to overcome the cultural handicaps of disadvantaged children by giving them compensatory programs even where tracking is not employed.⁵⁴

III. ASSESSMENT OF HOBSON'S CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES

A. Scope of the *Hobson* Standard

1. Groups Protected.—The close scrutiny traditionally accorded to statutes which single out individuals for differential treatment on the basis of race, alienage, or nationality can be attributed to a judicial suspicion that such statutes are the product of a legislature which is not pursuing permissible ends at all, but acting from a desire to make a discriminatory classification for its own sake. The *Hobson* court, although it deals with classifications which it has determined not to be prompted by racial or other discriminatory motives, rests its strict justification standard upon a similar assumption. The court justifies its active stance on the ground that government action which adversely affects "disadvantaged minorities" may well stem from decisions of—in the court's words—a "power structure"⁵⁵ which, although not racially prejudiced, is nevertheless unresponsive to the needs of Negroes and the poor. The restraint used by courts in exercising judicial review, the court reasons, is premised on the theory that the democratic process is the best means of working out solutions to social problems. However, since disadvantaged minorities are often politically impotent, their interests are not adequately heard and fairly resolved by the political process, and judges should not be reluctant to intervene when the interests of minorities have been slighted.⁵⁶

The court clearly regards its "disadvantaged minority" category as a limitation on the operation of its standard of review.⁵⁷ The court's standard must always be triggered by a finding of an adverse effect upon a "disadvantaged minority"; unlike voting, education is not such a "critical right" that all members of the population can claim the

⁵⁴ Such a requirement—that the school system act affirmatively to overcome cultural handicaps which it has not directly caused—would derive some support from *Griffin v. Illinois*, 351 U.S. 12 (1956), which can be seen as a case in which the Court required the state to act affirmatively to alleviate the effects of poverty, even though the state was not directly responsible for the defendant's inability to pay transcript fees. See generally Horowitz, *supra* note 15, at 1166–72.

⁵⁵ 269 F. Supp. at 407, 507.

⁵⁶ The *Hobson* court could have attempted to limit its doctrine to the District of Columbia, where there is special reason to believe that the interests of the local Negro population are not adequately served. The school board members, for example, are not elected locally or even appointed by officials responsible to the local population. See *id.* at 508 n.198. However, although the court frequently alludes to the political situation in the District, it enunciates its doctrine in terms which apply generally to American political structures.

⁵⁷ See 269 F. Supp. at 507–08; *id.* at 497.

benefit of active judicial intervention if deprived of equal treatment. The court's "disadvantaged minority" category can be criticized as being either too broad or too narrow.

The category can be criticized as too broad on the ground that it includes the poor as well as the Negro. The court cites *Griffin v. Illinois*⁵⁸ as a basis for including the poor within its specially protected group. Unembarrassed by the shift from *Griffin*'s criminal law context to education, the court seemingly uses the words "poor" and "Negro" interchangeably in its analysis of educational problems, and it indicates that practices which operate adversely to the poor should be subjected to the same close scrutiny applied to those which operate against the Negro. This approach is too facile; the constitutional status of the poor at least deserves separate analysis. The *Griffin* court invoked an "age-old"⁵⁹ notion of fundamental fairness — that the poor should not be subjected to a greater risk of being branded as criminal due to their poverty. In other areas, widely held notions of fairness are much less favorable to the poor, and indeed a society which uses monetary incentives depends in part upon unequal status for its functioning. Furthermore, the fourteenth amendment's historic concern for the Negro⁶⁰ and the Negro's long history of political impotence could provide a basis for limiting the benefits of the broad standard of review to him. Finally, the poor are not always easily identifiable; gradations of wealth present difficult problems of drawing distinctions.

On balance, however, the court is probably correct in not trying to distinguish between the poor and the Negro in the application of its standard. The notion that society must treat individuals differently if monetary incentives are to be effective has little force when applied to schoolchildren, who have not had the opportunity to respond to incentives. Furthermore, in a period of civil rights activism, the Negro cannot be assumed to be invariably less able to obtain equal justice in the political arena than the poor white. And the fact that distinguishing between indigents and non-indigents may be difficult in borderline cases seems an insufficient reason for denying relief if the court can identify a group which is clearly disadvantaged by any standard. Although extending the *Hobson* standard to all "disadvantaged minorities" gives the decision such broad scope that it may cause serious institutional problems, institutional problems do not justify drawing an untenable distinction between Negroes and equally underprivileged whites. If drawing untenable distinctions between aspiring beneficiaries of *Hobson*'s standard of review is indeed the only way to avoid giving the decision an uncomfortably broad scope, then the courts should fall back to a more permissive standard.⁶¹

The court's "disadvantaged minority" category can be criticized as too narrow on the ground that it denies the benefit of active judicial protection to individuals and sub-groups within the dominant majority.

⁵⁸ 351 U.S. 12 (1956).

⁵⁹ *Id.* at 16-17 (citing Leviticus and Magna Carta).

⁶⁰ Cf. *The Slaughter-House Cases*, 83 U.S. (16 Wall.) 36, 71-72 (1873).

⁶¹ Cf. *Roberson v. Rochester Folding Box Co.*, 171 N.Y. 538, 64 N.E. 442 (1902) (refusing to recognize right of privacy).

Plaintiffs who are not members of a "disadvantaged minority" must be content with a more permissive standard of review, however much they are harmed by a school system's failure to respond to their educational needs. However, the court's doctrine does not seem unduly partial in this respect if it uniformly excludes from the scope of the more active judicial protection only those plaintiffs who have a realistic chance of obtaining redress through political institutions. Thus interpreted, the *Hobson* doctrine seems to require a judicial determination of which groups in the community are underprivileged and politically impotent. The content of the "disadvantaged minority" category will vary in time and place; some ethnic groups which were once disadvantaged have managed to achieve equal status in American society, and minorities which are politically voiceless in some communities may be adequately represented or even dominant in others. Perhaps under the *Hobson* approach courts will be forced to scrutinize local power structures closely—for example, to determine whether a majority-Negro school board is truly representative of its local Negro constituency, or whether it is merely a tool of an underlying white power structure.⁶² Such factual determinations are necessarily difficult and uncertain. Furthermore, implementation of a constitutional standard which varies according to the construction of the local power structure seems likely to involve the courts in political controversy and to mar the classical image of judicial impartiality.

2. *Rights Protected.*—In support of its active judicial stance, the court stresses the critical importance of education to Negroes and the poor, who must rely upon the public schools to rescue themselves from their depressed cultural and educational condition. The court bolsters its argument by citing several cases in which statutes infringing upon "critical rights" in fields other than education have been closely scrutinized by the courts.⁶³ However, *Hobson* introduces "equal educational opportunity" into the company of "critical personal rights" without any attempt to draw a distinction between educational interests and other interests with a strong claim to importance, and indeed a principled distinction is not easily made. Although the significance of education cannot be gainsaid, the "critical rights" category is certainly much more difficult to contain once students' rights are added to those of criminal defendants and voters. The *Hobson* doctrine could lead to broad judicial review of many noneducational governmental activities—for example, urban renewal, zoning, public housing, public employment, and the distribution of fire protection, police protection, and other public services. It is difficult to say with confidence whether housing, employment, or education is more vital to disadvantaged minorities, or that adequate fire protection is not as important to a ghetto neighborhood as an adequate school. The possibility that the "critical rights" notion cannot be held on a short leash once it is applied to education is at least a reason for caution.

⁶² Cf. 269 F. Supp. 508 n.198 (although Negro members are now a majority on the Board of Education, they are "neither responsive nor responsible to the public will of the local, largely poor Negro community").

⁶³ See p. 1513 *supra*.

B. Institutional Considerations

The courts have already undertaken a massive task in correcting racially motivated educational policies; *Hobson* requires that they go further and correct policies which are not invidious but merely unresponsive to the educational needs of Negroes and the poor. This requirement will increase the burden, not only in terms of the number of cases but also in terms of the difficulty of individual cases. The *Hobson* court's inquiry is encyclopedic; its findings of fact occupy eighty-five pages in the reports, and they encompass diverse sources in education, psychology, and the social sciences. Nor will the remedies imposed by *Hobson* be easy to administer. The implementation of the court's decree will require a determination of whether a compensatory program instituted by the school board is "sufficient at least to overcome the detriment of segregation," and if not, whether the school board should be directed to try again with a new program. The court will also have to examine the desegregation plan submitted by the school board and weigh the almost imponderable benefit of an increase in integration against considerations of cost, safety, and convenience.

Of course, the possibility that a new approach will place heavy demands upon the court system is never in itself a sufficient reason for rejecting it. A more serious problem arises from the nature of the factual determinations which the court must make. A court applying the *Hobson* doctrine must necessarily resolve disputed issues of educational policy by determining whether integration by race or class is more desirable; whether compensatory programs should have priority over integration; whether equalization of physical facilities is an efficient means of allocating available resources for the purpose of achieving overall equal opportunity. There is a serious danger that judicial prestige will be committed to ineffective solutions, and that expectations raised by *Hobson*-like decisions will be disappointed. Furthermore, judicial intervention risks lending unnecessary rigidity to treatment of the social problems involved by foreclosing a more flexible, experimental approach.⁶⁴

The *Hobson* doctrine can be criticized for its unclear basis in precedent, its potentially enormous scope, and its imposition of responsibilities which may strain the resources and endanger the prestige of the judiciary. Perhaps such shortcomings are a sufficient reason for remitting the problems dealt with in *Hobson* to other institutions for resolution, subject to certain minimum checks designed to prevent ir-

⁶⁴ Judicial remedies need not be permanent or completely inflexible. See generally Sedler, *Conditional, Experimental and Substitutional Relief*, 16 RUTGERS L. REV. 639 (1962). However, a school board tired of adversary conflict may decide to follow the court's educational findings without attempting to acquire approval for plans based on opposing theories. Furthermore, when a *Hobson* decision is announced in a district or circuit containing several school districts, it may have a rigidifying effect upon school boards not parties to the case. The boards may feel constrained to follow the court's educational theories, even though they are not strictly binding, because they fear embarrassing and time-consuming litigation. Finally, judicial intervention in the educational field may hinder legislative attempts to consider the problems of poverty and race as a whole and work out comprehensive, interdependent solutions.

rational choices and ensure that political solutions are devoid of racial motivation. However, this solution must deal with one final argument: that if the courts do not attempt to solve the problems of providing equal opportunity to minorities, no one will; imperfect solutions are better than none; even if active intervention detracts from the traditional conception of the judicial process, the need to ensure equality for the Negro is so great, and so urgent, that the sacrifice is well taken. There is no completely persuasive answer to this argument: it presents the fundamental choice between the values to be derived from fidelity to conventional concepts of the judicial function and the values served by the present elimination of a strongly felt injustice. However, it is proper to indicate limits upon what the judiciary can accomplish alone even at the sacrifice of its traditional role. The court's fundamental premise is that it is dealing with a political structure which, although in the main not racially motivated, is at least unresponsive to the needs of Negroes and the poor, unwilling to strive constructively to alleviate the effects of poverty, and indifferent to the racial effects of its policies. The *Hobson* decision imposes upon this political structure an obligation to strive to improve the educational opportunity of disadvantaged schoolchildren by means which are likely to involve substantial additional expense. An unresponsive power structure could perhaps stymie the court by failing to provide enough funds properly to maintain the programs envisioned in *Hobson*.⁶⁵ Although the court can order equality within the school system, it cannot prevent the progressive deterioration of the entire system, at least not without a substantial extension of its present holding.⁶⁶ If the controllers of the power structure themselves receive little benefit from the school system — for example, when the system is predominantly Negro — this result does not seem unlikely.

Even if the political structure elects to supply the funds necessary to maintain the programs required by the *Hobson* court, the court has no power to require that the total amount of funds allocated toward alleviating poverty be increased. If the dominant majority has reasons strongly rooted in self-interest for declining to attack the problems of poverty comprehensively, a *Hobson* decision is unlikely to effect a fundamental change in the total amount of resources allocated to social welfare. Although the court can perhaps lead the community to make greater expenditures on education, it may do so at the cost of other social programs; the court cannot compel the community to maintain expenditures on subsidized housing, medical aid to the poor, job training programs, or welfare at present levels. Of course, it is im-

⁶⁵ The District's budget contains a restriction, reportedly imposed by Senator Byrd of West Virginia, forbidding the use of city funds to bus Negro children to white schools. N.Y. Times, Nov. 12, 1967, at 50, col. 4. Although such blatant attempts to subvert a court's decree are readily susceptible to judicial invalidation, more subtle forms of congressional resistance might cause serious problems.

⁶⁶ It has been suggested that courts could compel the states to ensure that educational resources are more equally allocated among various school districts within the state. See Rousselot, *supra* note 39, at 718-19. Although this approach is not possible in the District, it could be used by other federal courts applying the *Hobson* doctrine.

possible to predict with confidence that widespread application of the *Hobson* doctrine would have little beneficial effect. If a "power structure" is not indifferent but merely complacent or uninformed, the hortatory effect of a court's judgment, calling attention to injustices and articulating a means of correction, may jolt the local community into positive action. Furthermore, some of the remedies which could be ordered under the *Hobson* doctrine—redrawing of district lines, for example—do not involve substantial expense. Nevertheless, the limits upon what the judiciary can accomplish in an active role are an additional reason for circumspection, particularly in an area where the courts can offer no easy solutions.

A-3

89th Congress }
2d Session }

COMMITTEE PRINT

W.H. JP

A TASK FORCE STUDY OF THE PUBLIC
SCHOOL SYSTEM IN THE DISTRICT OF
COLUMBIA AS IT RELATES TO THE
WAR ON POVERTY

and

CONDUCTED BY THE
TASK FORCE ON ANTIPOVERTY IN THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



JUNE 1966

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor
ADAM C. POWELL, *Chairman*

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1966

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

ADAM C. POWELL, New York, *Chairman*

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky	WILLIAM H. AYRES, Ohio
EDITH GREEN, Oregon	ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Michigan
FRANK THOMSON, Jr., New Jersey	ALBERT H. QUIÉ, Minnesota
JAMES J. HOLLAND, Pennsylvania	CHARLES E. GOODELL, New York
ROMAN MINT, Pennsylvania	JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
DOMINICK V. JANSKI, Illinois	DAVE MARTIN, Nebraska
JOHN BRADEMAS, Pa., New Jersey	ALPHONZO BELL, California
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan	OGDEN R. REID, New York
RALPH J. SCOTT, North Carolina	GLENN ANDREWS, Alabama
HUGH L. CAREY, New York	EDWARD J. GURNEY, Florida
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California	
CARLTON R. SICKLES, Maryland	
SAM GIBBONS, Florida	
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan	
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Maine	
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii	
JAMES H. SCHEUER, New York	
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington	
PHILLIP BURTON, California	

LOUISE MAXIENNE DARGANS, *Chief Clerk*

RUSSELL C. DERRICKSON, *Staff Director*

C. SUMNER STONE, *Special Assistant to the Chairman*

DR. EUNICE S. MATTHEW, *Education Chief*

LEON ABRAMSON, *Chief Counsel for Labor-Management*

ODELL CLARK, *Chief Investigator*

TERESA CALABRESE, *Administrative Assistant to the Chairman*

MICHAEL J. BERNSTEIN, *Minority Counsel for Education and Labor*

CHARLES W. RAGGAEFF, *Special Counsel for Management*

TASK FORCE ON ANTIPOVERTY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Illinois, *Chairman*

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, *Counselor*

EDWARD J. GURNEY, Florida

JOHN R. KRAMER, *Counsel*

MRS. MIRIAM CARLNER, *Staff Analyst*

MARCA MAGIERA, *Clerk*

PREFACE

Education has been and continues to be the major "route to escape" for the poverty-stricken, providing the educational enterprise and its management function the way it should. Accordingly, it was fitting that the Task Force on Anti-Poverty in the District of Columbia direct its attention to the public schools in the District of Columbia. In particular, the Task Force addressed itself to the relevance of the educational program to the needs of the children and youth already plagued by the scourges of failure, frustration, and futility, despite their residence in the capital of the most affluent nation in the world.

The findings of the Task Force depict some deplorable conditions and raise an array of compelling questions requiring immediate action. Most critical of these problems is the entrapment of thousands of children in the lower layers of the highly-publicized track system which determines the quantity and quality of education a student receives. Parents of these children have come to call this arrangement "programed retardation." Dubious tests determine the fixed and fateful assignment of children to one course of study or another. Adroit remedial instruction and insightful developmental instruction, intended to be essential components of the lower tracks, are wanting. Little is expected and little is achieved. There is little chance for those in the basic or lowest track to become capable of respectable educational progress and to find their way upward into the general track, another catch-all program, to say nothing of ever reaching the offerings of the honors tracks. This freezing of children in this track system with little opportunity for cross-tracking or promotion from one track level to the next higher one is contrary to all principles of education in this democracy. Moreover, it is one sure way of dooming a large proportion of the young people in the District of Columbia to a life of ignorance and poverty. In even the last word in educational innovation in the District schools, the Model Schools, the Task Force points to dismal and all-too-common discrepancies between the rhetoric and the performance.

The necessity for committed, energetic, and productive professional personnel in the vital administrative, supervisory, and instructional posts here in the District of Columbia is strikingly clear. It may well take all of the "model budget" exhibited in this Report. One thing is certain. It will take responsible talent to produce results. It will take responsible government to enable a proper development of this school system. It will take a vigilant citizenry.

The story of education in the District of Columbia is not unlike that of many of the inner cities in the large urban centers of the Nation, where concentrations of disadvantaged children, largely of the racial minority groups, flounder in a morass of confusion and ineptitude. But the District of Columbia should serve as a paragon of educational and social engineering.

Hopefully, this Report will serve to jolt its readers sufficiently so that all who have responsibility will begin to act. Action is necessary now. Parents and children are justly restless. Resentment and despair can only lead to ugly, shameful, wasteful, and needless imbroglios. Instead, the educational system of the District of Columbia should reflect the culture and civilization which this Nation should possess in abundance and for all citizens.

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor.

A TASK FORCE STUDY OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AS IT RELATES TO THE WAR ON POVERTY

INTRODUCTION

The special Task Force of the House Committee on Education and Labor assigned to study the antipoverty program in the District of Columbia realized early in its investigation that no such study could be completed without some working knowledge of the District's school system, for, indeed, education is the keystone to any effective anti-poverty effort.

The Task Force was most seriously concerned with the degree to which the public school system of the Federal City has been neglected.

It was also deeply concerned with charges brought to its attention that widespread discrimination exists in the public schools in the Nation's Capital and that some of the programs in the school system not only help perpetuate segregation, but through such segregation, help "freeze" youngsters into a future of poverty.

This Task Force and its staff have made a reasonably thorough study of the District public school system in an effort to ascertain what, if any, relationship exists between the District public school system and any efforts to stamp out poverty in the District of Columbia.

It should be understood from the very outset that the limited facilities of this Task Force made difficult the type of in-depth study by competent educational authorities necessary to thoroughly understand the shortcomings of the District's public school system. But we have seen enough to eliminate any doubt that the deplorable state of the District's public schools does indeed doom thousands of District children to a life of poverty because they cannot get adequate education within existing facilities.

The Task Force has spent considerable time in public testimony and private discussions with Dr. Carl F. Hansen, Superintendent of the District school system, in an effort to better understand the problems of the District's schools.

We are encouraged by the many changes that Dr. Hansen has initiated even while the present investigation was underway. We are also encouraged to learn that Dr. Hansen has requested a full-scale, exhaustive study of the entire school system by competent educational authorities, and applaud the School Board for approving such a study.

But the Task Force does not believe that urgently needed reforms must await the completion of such a study.

The findings stated in this report show how urgently immediate action is necessary and it is our hope that Dr. Hansen will begin implementing even more remedial actions just as quickly as humanly possible.

Congress should view with a deep sense of urgency the model budget submitted to this task force by Dr. Hansen, for indeed it does reflect, through the eyes of this nationally known school administrator, the extent to which public schoolchildren in the District are being denied adequate facilities for meaningful education.

Dr. Hansen's model budget appears in the appendix of this report.

Dr. Hansen's proposed budget gives us some idea of the massive help needed if the District schools are to even begin their mission of educating District of Columbia students.

It is hoped that the District Committee in Congress and the District Commissioners will take appropriate action to provide part of the additional revenue necessary to meet the immediate needs of the schools in Washington through a modernization of the present tax structure in the District.

The Task Force feels that Congress, which too long has failed to meet its own responsibility toward the schools in the District, will respond much more effectively with additional Federal funds once its Members are convinced that the District's residents themselves are making a maximum effort through their own initiative to meet the financial needs of their public school system.

We also hope the appropriate committees of Congress will give immediate consideration to providing adequate legislation which would authorize the District to float bond issues through the Treasury Department for early construction of school building needs. It appears to this Task Force that the District should have the same right to amortize the cost of its immediate school needs over a period of years as do all other communities in the United States.

The Task Force congratulates President Johnson for recognizing the urgency of school needs in the District and for his request for additional funds to meet some of these needs.

The Task Force is convinced, however, that Congress itself will have to supply the bulk of funds necessary to provide a crash program for repairing years of neglect to the District schools. We believe the American people would support massive financial help to give their Federal City — a city visited annually by hundreds of thousands of citizens from all over America — a school system worthy of the Nation's Capital.

The District should have a school system so outstanding that it will become not only a laboratory for the best teaching techniques in the Nation but also a source of inspiration for the Nation's 35,000 individual school districts.

The Task Force is most grateful for the assistance it has received from Dr. Hansen and his staff; from the various civic and religious groups in the District of Columbia; from the various civil rights groups in the District; and from the news media.

In urging abolition of the track system in its present form, this Task Force sincerely hopes no one will read into this recommendation any diminution of our profound respect for Dr. Hansen. Our recommendation constitutes an honest difference of opinion among honest people, all of whom have a single purpose — to provide this generation of District schoolchildren with an education which will help them realize the great promise of America.

The Task Force, in its visits to the District schools and its interviews with students in these schools, finds that it is not always possible

to judge the potential capabilities of boys and girls who have been brought up under poverty stricken conditions. Often they are much brighter than their school performance would indicate and, with attention to their individual needs, can be brought along with amazing results.

We have asked the Library of Congress to prepare for us an analysis of how other selected major cities handle ability grouping. We are most grateful to the Library of Congress and Miss Martha Grosse for the diligent response to our request. The study is included in the Appendix of the report.

Modern testing programs used in other parts of the Nation show that some school dropouts tested as dull have proved easily capable of going on to college.

It is a strong suspicion of this task force that many such students could be found in the District schools through more effective testing programs. We further feel that the track system in its present form actually helps "freeze" a youngster into a future of poverty.

It is for this reason that we urge serious consideration be given to either revising the whole track system or dropping it entirely.

The Task Force further believes that if the educational growth of the children is to be raised so must the educational growth of their teachers. District teachers must have an opportunity to learn both content and methods simultaneously. The Task Force believes that some method must be developed which will provide sufficient time for inservice teacher training programs to be conducted in the actual school to which teachers are assigned. The School Board might want to consider revising its schedule in such a manner that solid subjects would be taught during the first 3 days of the school week, leaving the remaining 2 days for inservice training programs for teachers, while their students would participate in various cultural enrichment programs during the same 2 days which now constitute part of every school day throughout the school week.

We are also indebted to the following individuals who have made this report possible: Mrs. David Carliner, who headed the investigative staff, Mrs. Cynthia Crites, Mrs. Thelma Snell, and Miss Marcia Magiera.

Finally, the Task Force is particularly grateful to the John F. Kennedy League for Universal Social Justice and Good Will for its invaluable assistance.

It is our sincere hope that this report will help bring into sharper focus the tragic deterioration of the District's public school system, and with its recommendations, will inspire all parties concerned, including Members of Congress who, on District Days, sit not only as Members of Congress but also as members of the District's "City Council," in meeting the urgent educational needs in the Nation's Capital.

President Johnson has properly stated that time is running out in meeting the District's needs. We believe the situation in the District's schools is so deplorable that no time can be lost in bringing immediate and massive assistance.

Since Congress is responsible for the management of the District's affairs, Congress will have to assume full responsibility for any consequences which may arise as a result of the District's tragic school shortages.

4 D.C. SCHOOLS AS THEY RELATE TO THE WAR ON POVERTY

We further firmly believe that no amount of effort to eliminate poverty in the District can succeed without placing maximum priority on giving the victims of poverty a sound, basic education. Yet another generation is doomed to a life of poverty in the Nation's Capital if present District school needs are not immediately corrected.

GENERAL INFORMATION

The District of Columbia, with 764,000 people, is the Nation's ninth largest city, set in a metropolitan area which totals more than 2 million. It is a city preponderantly of white-collar workers, with more than a quarter of its labor force employed by Government agencies. Yet, the family setting for most of Washington's schoolchildren is one of educational and economic handicap.

While half of Washington's families earn more than \$6,000 a year, two-thirds of the elementary school children come from neighborhoods where the median family income is less than that, almost a fifth having incomes of less than \$4,000. Eighty percent live in neighborhoods where the majority of adults do not have a completed high school education; more than 25 percent live in areas where the adults have never enrolled in a high school.

These hardships bear most heavily upon Negro schoolchildren who make up almost 93 percent of Washington's school population. Nearly 65 percent of the Negro families earn less than \$6,000 a year, compared with 35 percent of the white families. For incomes below \$3,000, the proportion of Negro families is roughly 25 percent; of whites, approximately 10 percent. The disparity in school experience is similar. Two and a quarter percent of the white persons, 25 years of age or older, had no more than one to four grades of schooling, but for Negroes the proportion is 9.3 percent. For those whose educations ended with eight grades or less, the proportion for whites is 22.1 percent; for Negroes, 40.7 percent.

Thus, any study of the effects of poverty upon the administration and operation of the public schools in Washington must be sensitive to the special disadvantages which the majority of its schoolchildren have suffered as the heritage of generations of discrimination, although nominally extirpated by law, has not yet been removed from their social and economic environment.

BOARD OF EDUCATION

As the agency responsible for formulating the policies for Washington's public schools, the Board of Education must be the starting point for any examination of the adequacy of its programs for children who suffer the impact of poverty.

The Board is composed of nine members who are selected by the judges of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. The sole qualifications imposed by law upon the choice of Board members are that the members must have been residents of the District of Columbia for 5 years and that three of the members must be women. By custom, the Board's membership has included three Negroes, members of each of the three major religious faiths, and residents of various neighborhoods in the city.

A judicial selection committee, composed of three judges, generally prior residents of Washington, receives suggestions from community organizations and individuals but conducts no formal procedures for receiving nominations or for hearing the views of citizens' organizations regarding intended appointees. Selected prospective appointees are interviewed personally by the judicial committee. Of the three members of that committee, two were prominent in the business community, one of them having been general counsel of the Washington Board of Trade. The ultimate choice is made by the full membership of the U.S. district court, sitting in executive session, upon the recommendations of the selection committee.

Despite the apparent effort of the judges of the district court to appoint members from a cross-section of the community, it cannot be said that the Board of Education is representative of the citizens of the District of Columbia. All of its present nine members are either professional or businessmen or the wives of such men. Two are lawyers, one a physician, one a lawyer-banker, one a businessman, one a teacher, one a minister, and two are housewives who live in affluent neighborhoods and whose husbands are engaged in professional work.

Almost 30 years ago, a Presidential Advisory Committee on Education reported that since the district court acquired the power to select the members of the Board of Education in 1906, it never appointed a member from clerical, service or manual labor groups. The Advisory Committee declared:

Whether this situation is due to a deliberate policy or merely to oversight * * * it cannot be justified * * * (although) * * * Persons should not be appointed to the Board of Education as group representatives. * * * From the point of view of the public, no particular section of the population should control the schools, and the schools should have the advantage of contributions from the entire community. The public schools should never be regarded as class institutions, and they cannot afford to be without such help as is available from all of the groups of the community * * * The need for a more cosmopolitan membership of the Board should be taken into account for future appointments.

The district court has chosen not to heed this recommendation. With one exception, the court continued to appoint practicing lawyers, physicians, businessmen, educators, and upper and middle income

housewives. The exception came from the largest occupational group in Washington, a retired Government employee who served an uncompleted term of 6 months.

The Board is also marked apart from the residents of Washington, and especially the community which provides school age children, by the ages of its members. The youngest member is 45 and the oldest is 79. Three are over 70. Only two of the present members of the Board have school age children.

Apart from the preference which the district court has shown for the older and affluent segments of the community, the evidence is clear that its judges have tended to avoid the appointment of persons, otherwise qualified, who are regarded as "controversial." This criterion for exclusion has, indeed, been explicitly stated by the present chairman of the district court's committee for the selection of Board members. One indication of the court's concept of what is "controversial" is the fact that no person who has been publicly identified as a critic of the operations of the school system while serving as a member of the Board has ever been appointed to a second term.

The detailed findings which are set forth in this report all relate to areas for which policy guidelines should have been fixed by the Board of Education. Yet in almost every case, virtually no independent study has been given to the issues by the Board. It fails to provide an adequate forum for the resolution of controverted educational problems. For most fields, the role which the Board has adopted has been merely to review and to accept proposals which have come to it from the Superintendent of Schools.

It is necessary and appropriate for the Superintendent, as the chief executive officer of the school system, to propose policies to the Board concerning issues which go to the root of the relation of the public schools to the community, such as the allocation of school resources within the city, the examination of curricula and formulation of a policy regarding the school role in promoting racial integration, the development of programs for children in poverty neighborhoods, and a statement of education goals.

For answers to these questions, and many others, the citizens of the District are entitled to an informed and independent evaluation by the members of the Board of Education. What they get, for the most part, is a cursory approval of whatever recommendations are made by the professional staff of the school system.

The introduction of the four-track curriculum in the District schools illustrates the role which the Board has performed in what has been perhaps the most controversial recent issue in the school system. The proposal emanated from a committee of high school principals and subject supervisors, working under the direction of Superintendent Hansen.

With only the Superintendent's favorable recommendation before it, with no position stating comprehensively and objectively all aspects of the proposal, with neither a contrary memorandum or independent study, the Board of Education gave approval to the Superintendent's initial recommendation that the track system be introduced in the high schools in 1956. Thereafter, upon the basis of similar recommendations by the Superintendent it was gradually extended to the junior high schools and then to the elementary schools.

Although Superintendent Hansen has stated that the system "has been intensively and continuously studied" by the Board of Educa-

tion, so far as the published materials before the Board reveal, its studies, until a belated public hearing 9 years later in April 1965, have been almost exclusively of the favorable materials presented to it by the Superintendent. On the few occasions when community organizations appeared before the Board to express views on the operation of the track system, only the most perfunctory attention was given by the Board to the subject.

Failure of the Board of Education to give the independent and objective study of the issues relating to the track system is compounded by the absence of any in-depth discussion of the question. Although the Board has nine standing committees and occasional ad hoc committees on subjects ranging from finance to students, *not one committee of the Board is charged with responsibility in the fields of curricula and educational programs.* As a result, there has never been the close analysis, which the committee system intends, of what has come to be the most important guiding principle of the District's public schools.

The treatment of other policy subjects has been similar. An examination of the minutes of the meetings of the Board of Education indicates that a large portion of its time is given to ceremonial functions, *minutiae*, to such administrative matters as the assignment and promotion of individual teachers. In only rare instances has the Board of Education addressed itself to an examination of the fundamental policies which should govern the conduct of the city's public schools. Superintendent Hansen has stated in another connection that "experience in administration shows that a school board functions effectively only if it guards its own policymaking duties against erosion * * *".

What has happened in Washington is that the Board has in effect abdicated its policymaking functions to the Superintendent of Schools. The role which a citizen board of education is intended to perform—that of placing the ultimate control of the schools in the citizens of that community—has not been fulfilled.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That so long as the district court retains the authority to appoint the members of the Board of Education, procedures be adopted to receive formally nominations for appointment to the Board and provide that no person may be appointed without an order of publication and an opportunity afforded to interested persons to present their views on the proposed appointments.
2. That the Board of Education establish committees to consider all major phases of operations of the District schools, including curricula and educational programs.
3. That the Board of Education employ personnel to prepare independent studies to assist in passing upon recommendations submitted to it by the Superintendent of Schools.
4. That, ultimately, School Board members be elected by the citizens of the District of Columbia for a stipulated term of service.

SCHOOL BUILDINGS

For years, Congress, with the cooperation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, has denied Washington enough money to build the schools needed by its children.

Since 1961, the Commissioners have approved less than two-thirds of the capital requests made by the Board of Education.

Congress, after further paring by the District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, approved little more than half of the original amount requested.

Comparable cuts were made in the School Board's requests for maintenance funds.

By 1965 the Washington schools had accumulated unmet maintenance needs amounting to more than \$5 million. Dr. Hansen has testified that not less than \$268 million is required to overcome the obsolescence, depreciation, and shortage of space in the schools in the District.

Denial of adequate funds for capital outlays in the schools has meant a school plant which in almost every area of the city is tragically outdated and overcrowded.

In most buildings, substandard space is used for classroom purposes. Hundreds of children are on part-time schedules.

Many children cannot attend kindergarten because there is no room for them.

There can be no more depressing experience than for a person to visit some of the District's schools which are dismal, unimaginative, dreary and, for the most part, completely unconducive to any inspiration either for teaching or learning.

Thirty-one classroom buildings date back to the 1800's; an additional 36 buildings were constructed before World War I.

Washington ranks in fifth place in terms of the age of its school buildings among 16 cities with populations between 500,000 and a million.

Despite the fact that 70 percent of all elementary school construction since 1958 has been placed in areas where the median yearly family income was below \$6,000, the oldest, most overcrowded schools continue to be in the poorest parts of the city.

Of the 49 elementary schools which will receive special funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 because they are in areas of concentrated poverty, 35 were built more than 50 years ago. Many of these are more than 60, 70, and 80 years old. One of them was built 93 years ago.

Of the 22 elementary schools in areas where median family income is under \$4,000 and median schooling of adults is at the eighth grade level, 14 schools are over 50 years old, and 8 were built before 1900.

By contrast, of the 12 elementary schools west of Rock Creek Park serving primarily white, middle-class children, only 3 are over 50 years old.

The obsolescence of the buildings bears the more heavily upon the poorer children because their schools are crowded beyond the schools' intended capacity.

The area west of Rock Creek Park is the only section of the city where the elementary schools are not overcrowded. Some of the buildings are, in fact, half empty. In others, the enrollment could be increased by more than a third without reaching capacity.

In the system as a whole, underutilized schools leave space for about 4,000 pupils. Many of the empty spaces are in the dozen elementary schools west of Rock Creek Park, while east of the park hundreds of children are crowded into schools which are too small to hold them. None of the buildings in these areas is underutilized, and many of them have 100 or 200 pupils in excess of their capacity.

Among the 49 elementary schools in areas of poverty, 14 buildings have more than 100 children beyond the intended space; in 4 schools, the excess enrollment is greater than 200.

Although the citywide average pupil-teacher ratio is approximately 31 in the elementary schools, over half of the classes exceed this figure. Many are over 35, and several are in the 40's.

All of the 22 elementary schools in zones where the median family income is below \$4,000 have oversized classes.

The toll of overcrowding has resulted in a denial of all schooling for some children and in shortchanging others of their share of classroom instruction and quality education.

From 1956 to 1965, 6,236 children on waiting lists for kindergarten were denied admission for lack of space. The fall term of 1965 opened with 445 children waiting to be admitted to kindergarten in 30 schools. By November 1965, 198 registered children were still from neighborhoods with annual median income below \$6,000. This limited number, however, fails to reflect the full need for additional kindergarten space. Roughly 2,500 5-year-old children are not enrolled in kindergarten; the school administration estimates that 40 percent of the children who enter first grade have had no kindergarten experience.

In addition to these kindergarten-age children who are denied schooling, an additional 2,134 children in the first and second grades in 18 elementary schools are attending half time. Thirteen of these schools have an almost completely Negro student body. Fifteen are in areas where the annual median family income is below the District average; 12 in census tracts where the income median is under \$5,000.

The shortage of space has led to the use of substandard and inappropriate facilities: underground basements, locker rooms, lunchrooms, laundry areas, shower rooms, storerooms, teachers' lounges, and auditoriums.

From 1953-54 to 1964-65, the number of substandard rooms increased from 78 to 377. Although the number of such rooms was reduced in 1965, 5,652 elementary school children remained in classrooms intended for other purposes.

The disadvantage to children in the lower income neighborhoods resulting from the lack of classroom space will be felt even more severely in the administration of funds being made available under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Of the 49 elementary schools which are to have auxiliary programs for remedial reading, speech therapy, counseling, and special courses

in mathematics and science under this Federal-aid program, 35 are so overcrowded that they already utilize large segments of nonclassroom space in the building for instructional purposes. Seven of the nine junior high schools which are to have additional programs now lack space for their presently scheduled classes. Therefore, even though funds now are made available for remedial teaching in the poverty areas, many programs will not be implemented simply because there is no space in already overcrowded school buildings for additional classrooms.

This is one of the most brutal tragedies of our times in Washington.

The ultimate solution for the inadequacy of the District school plant necessarily lies with Congress.

President Johnson deserves the highest commendation for recognizing the urgency of the school situation in the District and for his recommendation to bring substantially more help at the time. The \$39 million he has recommended in additional funds for school construction should be approved by Congress forthwith and substantially increased.

The committee was also pleased to learn Dr. Hansen is contemplating the use of rental space available for additional classes.

Precedent for this procedure was established under Project Head-start which used nonpublic buildings. Classrooms in Sunday school buildings, play rooms in apartment developments, houses, stores, and other types of buildings, although perhaps not optimal places for school, are at least as usable as existing substandard classrooms, and are certainly preferable to denying any child the full programs which the public schools have to offer.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the School Board and District Commissioners explore immediately the possibility of substantial tax increases in the District on real estate, cigarettes, alcoholic beverages, gasoline, and hotel and motel room rentals to provide substantial additional funds for school buildings.

2. That Congress substantially increase its contribution toward District schools once there is an assurance that District taxes are carrying their fair share of the burden.

3. That the school system embark upon a program of securing rental space in appropriate buildings in order to provide adequate classroom and other education facilities to every child in the public schools.

4. That the School Board be authorized to float bond issues—with voter approval, if necessary—to finance part of the immediate building needs of the District school system, and amortize the cost of these programs over a period of future years.

TEACHERS

Washington's public schools, like those throughout the country, have faced a shortage of qualified teachers. In common with most of the large cities, its school system must compete with neighboring and usually wealthier suburbs, which offer comparable or better salaries, newer and more attractive schools, and perhaps less difficult educational problems. The District, in addition, must compete with the Federal Government and nongovernmental organizations which are able to offer a wide variety of employment opportunities for persons with training in education.

As a result, although the public schools have been able to recruit teachers for virtually all of the available positions, the proportion of teachers who lack the required qualifications has more than doubled in the last 10 years.

In 1955, 16.4 percent of the teachers employed had temporary status without tenure because of failure to meet the prescribed qualifications. In 1965, 40 percent of all teachers had temporary status.

Given the underlying problem of the national shortage of teachers in the wake of a vastly expanded school enrollment, the recruitment of qualified teachers in the District schools is affected by several factors:

1. Budgeting

Dependence of the District schools on funds appropriated by Congress presents a special problem in the timely hiring of teachers. By the time the school budget is prepared by the Superintendent, presented for approval to the Board of Education, sent to the District Commissioners for inclusion in the general District of Columbia budget and finally approved by the Congress, it is too late in the year to recruit new teachers for the fall opening of school.

Thus, the congressional appropriation for 1964-65 was not enacted until December 1964, 3 months following the opening of schools in September. The urgent need for 300 new teachers at the beginning of the new year coupled with the late funding created a situation that could only be solved by the schools' employment of seniors before their graduation from the District of Columbia Teachers College.

Timing of congressional action needs to be changed to permit the District of Columbia school system to hire teachers in time for the opening of the school year in September. Most school systems sign contracts with teachers in the spring, impossible in Washington where the budget is not approved by Congress until late in the year.

2. Salaries

Salaries for District teachers compare favorably with those in the metropolitan suburban area. For teachers with a B.A. degree, both the minimum and maximum salaries allowable are somewhat higher than in the neighboring counties, although for teachers with M.A.

degrees two of the surrounding suburbs offer a higher maximum. The average teacher's salary for the District of Columbia in fiscal year 1964 ranged between \$7,412 and \$7,450.

But comparisons do not state the problem.

More than 10 years ago, the 1955 White House Conference on Education urged that "teaching must be made a financially comfortable profession" in order to attract "the most able young men and women." While teacher salaries have, of course, increased in the last decade, they have not improved in relation to the salaries and wages paid to other occupational groups. With national attention focused on the need for developing new approaches to training and recruiting personnel for the schools, the District might well adopt, as one method, the experiment of offering salaries commensurate with other professional employment.

3. Recruitment

Present recruitment of teachers relies primarily upon the formal efforts of individual employees of the school system. A limited program of visits to colleges in the East and in the Middle West as well as liaison with local colleges is also used to acquaint prospective teachers with the opportunities in the District schools. That the Washington public schools attract teachers throughout the country is indicated to an extent by the fact that its new teachers in the 1965-66 school year came from 212 universities and colleges. The largest numbers, as would be expected, are graduates of local institutions. But of these, two-thirds came from 2 colleges; 63 from District of Columbia Teachers College; 50 from Howard University; George Washington University was responsible for 20 teachers; the University of Maryland, 11; American University, Catholic University, Dumbarton College, Gallaudet, and Georgetown University for the remaining 29.

To state the problem in another way, of approximately 350 students who completed requirements for teaching in District colleges and universities, only half remained to teach in Washington's public schools.

4. Appointment

The hiring process has been unnecessarily complicated and has proved discouraging to prospective teachers. Recruiters are not authorized to indicate even tentative acceptance of qualified applicants and in the time taken to process an application, a competing school system may hire a teacher willing to work in Washington. No centralized personnel department exists to deal with all teacher employment and placement. As a result, a teacher applicant must often go to a number of offices in different parts of the city to be interviewed by various officials, including persons as high ranking as the assistant superintendents of elementary and secondary schools. Proposed changes in hiring procedures are pending before the Board of Education to provide for a centralized system for interviewing all teacher applicants, while the assignment of teachers would remain with the responsible assistant superintendent in the elementary and secondary schools.

5. Licensing

Teachers in District schools fall into three categories: permanent, those who have met all licensing requirements; probationary, those

who have the necessary qualifications except length of service and are therefore serving an interim period to acquire tenure; and temporary, those who are without tenure and with limited salary scale, and who have failed to fulfill one or more of the requirements.

Most of those unable to meet the licensing requirements for permanent teachers lack the prescribed courses in educational methods or have failed to pass the national teacher examination. Sixty percent of the temporary personnel have not qualified because of a shortage of required courses. Another 25 percent of the temporary personnel have failed or failed to take the NTE, and the remaining 15 percent do not meet licensing requirements for various reasons.

Proposed revisions of license requirements have been pending before the Board of Education for nearly 2 years. Their effect would be to permit many teachers presently in the temporary category to obtain licensing as permanent teachers by relaxing the requirements for certain so-called methods courses. The national teacher examination would be retained as a requirement, although the District of Columbia is the only school system in the metropolitan area which requires either a written or oral examination of otherwise qualified applicants.

The Task Force finds it most difficult to understand why the School Board has delayed final action on revision of the licensing requirements.

6. Pupil-teacher ratio

While the Board of Education has called for a better pupil-teacher ratio, it has not reached its goal. The Board's standard for elementary grades is 30 pupils to a teacher, and 25 students to 1 teacher in high schools.

In 1964-65 the average class size in the elementary schools was 30.2. It was 26.8 in academic and art classes in junior high and 28.3 for academic classes in senior high schools. Such averages mean that many classes continue to be larger than the Board's standard.

7. Working conditions

Teachers like everyone else are entitled to decent working conditions. More of them must be attracted to teach in schools serving the inner city. Teaching here is not easy. It presents a challenge to each teacher, and an appeal must be made to those eager to respond to a difficult job. But the school system can help facilitate their job in a number of ways.

A recent survey conducted among District of Columbia teachers indicated their needs in the following order: smaller classes; special classes for children with special needs; supplementary instructional materials; aids and clerks; auxiliary personnel such as health, psychiatric, and psychological staff; educationally and culturally enriching field trips; inservice teacher institutes; classroom construction; home visitors and social workers; and special audiovisual aids for disadvantaged pupils.

Too many of these needs continue to be strangers to the School Board.

The problem of working conditions can be demonstrated in a comparison of elementary schools in high and low income neighborhoods. There is a correlation between high income and such teacher quality characteristics as experience, permanent status, and postgraduate degrees. In addition, professional staff-pupil ratios are lower and per-

pupil expenditures are higher in the elementary schools in high income neighborhoods.

This correlation is not perfect; however, the data does indicate that incentives to attract experienced high quality teachers into low income schools are lacking.

The problem seems to be at its worst in the lower middle income neighborhoods, rather than in the lowest groups. The schools in the \$5,000 to \$6,000 range have the highest staff-pupil ratio, the lowest percentage of teachers with advanced degrees, and the second lowest per pupil rate of expenditure. On the other hand, the staff-pupil ratio for the lowest group is closer to the staff-pupil ratio in the highest income group, than to the ratio in the \$5,000 to \$6,000 range. This seems to indicate that it is possible to retain good teachers in even the poorest neighborhoods. Additional conscious effort must be made to attract the best teachers to the areas in which they are most needed, and better working conditions is basic to any program of this nature.

Data for neighborhood income groups and individual schools follows:

Quality of education characteristics as compared with income levels of school's neighborhood

[District of Columbia data from June and December 1965]

Neighborhood income groups	Per pupil expenditure	Percent of teachers with B.A.	Percent of teachers with M.A.	Percent of teachers with under 4 years experience	Percent with over 10 years experience	Percent of temporary teachers	Pupils per professional staff	Staff per 100 in kindergarten	Enrollment as a percent of capacity
\$12,000 and up -----	400	76.2	27.4	32.0	38.0	23.3	23.8	2.3	80.7
\$11,000 to \$11,999 -----	438	66.7	33.3	23.6	64.2	19.0	24.4	2.3	76.3
\$10,000 to \$10,999 -----	387	66.5	33.5	16.0	63.5	18.8	25.6	2.8	85.7
\$9,000 to \$9,999 -----	357	75.5	24.5	24.8	30.5	21.8	27.0	2.4	78.6
\$8,000 to \$8,999 -----	299	58.3	41.7	16.0	42.0	25.0	28.6	1.7	118.6
\$7,000 to \$7,999 -----	335	79.5	21.5	25.0	44.7	31.3	27.0	1.9	118.7
\$6,000 to \$6,999 -----	300	79.1	20.9	23.9	34.1	43.9	29.4	1.7	114.0
\$5,000 to \$5,999 -----	298	81.5	18.5	24.7	30.7	46.0	30.6	1.7	111.8
\$4,000 to \$4,999 -----	297	81.4	18.6	30.8	28.0	47.3	27.8	1.7	116.1
\$3,999 and under -----	309	79.6	20.4	29.2	28.2	46.2	26.6	1.9	111.5

Breakdown by individual schools

Wesley	Per pupil expenditure	Percent of teachers with B.A.	Percent of teachers with M.A.	Percent of teachers with under 4 years experience	Percent with over 10 years experience	Percent of temporary teachers	Staff per 100 pupils	Staff per 100 pupils in kindergarten	Percent enrollment to capacity
\$12,000 and up:									
Key -----	471	56	44	33	33	25	4.9	3.0	57.3
Hardy -----	404	100	0	25	38	25	4.6	-----	55.5
Shepherd -----	325	62	38	38	43	20	3.1	1.5	114.9
Average -----	400	73	27	32	38	23	4.2	2.3	80.7
\$11,000 to \$11,999:									
Eaton -----	458	23	77	2	90	7	3.4	2.0	77.3
Hearst -----	380	75	25	17	67	33	3.8	3.0	83.3
Jackson -----	627	60	40	20	60	33	6.1	-----	36.3
Janney -----	359	72	28	39	44	0	4.1	1.8	77.7
Oyster -----	369	100	0	40	60	22	3.3	2.4	107.0
Average -----	438	67	33	24	64	19	4.1	2.3	76.3

Breakdown by individual schools—Continued

	Per pupil expend- iture	Percent of teach- ers with B.A.	Percent of teach- ers with M.A.	Percent of teach- ers with under 4 years experi- ence	Percent with over 10 years experi- ence	Percent of tem- porary teachers	Staff per 100 pupils	Staff per 100 pupils in kinder- garten	Percent enroll- ment to capacity
\$10,000 to \$10,999									
Lafayette	314	72	28	20	52	20	3.3	1.7	104.9
Madison	445	67	33	22	56	33	3.0	3.9	79.7
•MPPS	338	71	29	6	79	19	3.8	2.2	93.3
Stoddert	454	46	44	22	67	13	4.4	3.2	65.0
Average	387	67	33	16	64	19	3.9	2.8	85.7
\$0,000 to \$0,999									
Benning Hill	246	56	14	17	24	38	3.2	1.7	105.2
Fall River	480	56	50	33	17	3	3.5	2.7	48.1
Hyde	417	79	24	28	43	20	4.7	3.7	132.2
Leighland	371	50	10	24	38	29	3.7	1.4	111.8
Average	377	70	24	25	31	22	3.7	2.4	78.6
\$5,000 to \$8,999									
Barronelas	279	76	24	20	32	39	3.4	1.7	110.1
Kenne	385	76	24	23	31	46	3.2	1.7	143.6
LaSalle	333	17	83	7	63	5	3.9	1.8	102.2
Average	300	58	41	19	32	25	3.5	2.9	118.6
\$7,000 to \$7,999									
Brent	846	86	11	31	19	7	3.2	1.7	127.9
Brightwood	588	67	48	19	40	13	3.5	2.0	110.2
Brockland	374	92	8	6	58	8	3.2	1.9	109.4
Cardozo	649	69	49	40	40	30	7.1	3.8	38.9
Edgewall	562	91	9	34	10	79	3.3	1.5	147.9
Neuwe	386	79	21	31	48	21	3.5	1.8	116.8
Reedville Heights	338	89	18	9	63	50	3.1	2.0	178.3
Shaw	349	87	15	18	71	25	3.2	2.0	117.4
Takoma	317	74	26	26	37	26	3.5	3.6	115.8
Wood	250	80	20	40	40	24	3.3	1.7	121.4
Wright	274	80	20	37	25	48	3.5	1.4	124.2
Average	335	79	21	25	31	31	3.7	2.0	118.7
\$0,000 to \$0,999									
Adams	393	83	17	47	42	47	3.5	1.7	56.7
Burns	247	73	27	37	27	50	3.1	1.2	130.3
Carroll	271	79	21	26	33	50	3.6	1.4	125.0
Draper	273	87	13	8	21	50	3.4	1.7	126.7
Hilltop	238	82	18	44	6	74	3.0	1.4	123.3
Orr	317	100	10	18	9	50	2.9	1.5	119.0
Patterson	382	79	21	12	48	30	3.2	1.9	102.2
Petworth	265	70	30	26	41	28	3.3	1.7	99.2
Petworth	265	70	30	28	41	28	3.3	1.7	120.5
Powell	276	76	24	10	55	31	3.2	1.8	115.7
Randall	313	80	20	24	52	42	3.4	1.4	129.7
River Terrace	352	74	26	13	53	32	3.5	1.5	103.3
Rudolph	264	71	26	19	37	42	3.3	1.4	90.1
Shaw	351	87	13	38	13	55	3.2	1.4	128.1
Trinidad	393	53	47	12	76	3	4.3	2.7	129.0
Woodridge	325	82	18	27	38	31	3.1	1.4	122.6
Average	300	79	21	24	34	44	3.4	1.7	113.0
\$5,000 to \$8,999									
Brent	322	62	38	38	25	63	4.5	2.2	93.3
Carver	429	100	0	22	67	19	3.2	1.9	143.3
Congress									
Heights	288	81	19	19	33	54	3.3	1.7	145.8
Cooke	289	74	26	16	32	28	3.4	1.4	110.7
Davis	254	86	14	25	18	47	3.4	1.4	115.4
Drew	288	77	23	17	23	66	3.7	1.6	80.1
Eckington	267	70	30	20	0	60	3.5		125.0
Emery	278	96	4	30	39	50	3.3	1.4	118.4
Gage	280	85	15	38	15	77	3.4	2.0	108.9
Garfield	276	80	20	40	20	54	3.2	1.4	116.2
Goding	280	70	30	3	58	3	3.4	1.5	105.5
Houston	260	82	18	9	39	30	3.9	1.4	90.8
Ketcham	283	89	11	33	19	60	3.4	1.7	140.2
Merritt	342	88	12	29	46	34	4.2	2.7	76.4
Morgan	299	70	30	33	33	34	3.5	1.6	135.5
Morton	321	79	21	26	49	42	3.1	1.4	123.9
Nalle	258	96	4	32	20	60	3.5	1.9	94.5
Plummer	261	84	16	16	16	50	3.5	1.5	110.9

Breakdown by individual schools—Continued

	Per pupil expenditure	Percent of teachers with B.A.	Percent of teachers with M.A.	Percent of teachers with under 4 years experience	Percent with over 10 years experience	Percent of temporary teachers	Staff per 100 pupils	Staff per 100 pupils in kindergarten	Percent enrollment to capacity
\$5,000 to \$5,999—Continued									
Richardson									
Shadd	301	80	20	27	27	37	4.2	1.6	97.4
Stanton	339	86	14	19	32	47	4.1	2.1	101.2
Stevens	327	80	20	18	40	40	3.2	1.4	120.5
Turner	341	88	12	19	38	36	5.2	2.6	61.5
Average	261	71	29	40	17	67	3.3	1.6	117.1
\$4,000 to \$4,999:									
Aiton	270	83	17	44	14	59	3.5	1.5	100.7
Amidon	277	71	29	40	17	67	3.3	1.6	117.1
Benning	293	94	6	17	17	38	3.4	1.6	100.0
Blair	336	89	11	33	11	59	3.4	2.3	111.3
Blow	296	77	23	15	23	40	3.8	2.2	125.9
Bowen	316	70	30	15	56	41	3.5	1.5	90.8
Bruce	308	90	10	26	37	45	3.7	1.4	111.8
Bryan	307	80	20	21	48	37	3.3	1.5	113.8
Buchanan	260	78	22	35	26	60	3.5	1.4	116.3
Burrville	373	68	32	20	40	30	3.9	1.4	98.3
Crummel	316	90	10	32	5	55	3.7	1.4	113.3
Edmonds	291	58	42	25	45	60	3.4	2.1	132.6
Giddings	335	81	19	22	42	40	4.3	1.7	92.0
Hayes	328	100	0	50	13	53	3.8	1.9	97.9
Kingsman	277	94	6	34	13	69	3.3	1.4	127.5
Lenox	327	83	17	21	8	67	3.6	1.6	132.0
Lewis	192	80	20	43	13	63	3.4	1.7	110.2
Logan	274	78	22	31	31	41	3.6	1.9	164.6
Lovejoy	290	88	12	23	38	39	3.4	2.0	124.2
Ludlow	316	78	22	22	22	53	4.4	2.1	84.4
Madison	248	92	8	46	38	42	4.3	1.7	97.9
Maury	254	86	14	36	25	63	3.0	1.4	184.9
Meyer	244	70	30	-----	-----	36	3.3	1.7	120.5
Miner	263	70	30	-----	-----	35	3.6	1.7	105.9
Monroe	364	82	18	13	55	48	3.3	1.8	141.4
Park View	305	67	33	8	34	28	3.7	1.6	97.2
Payne	323	78	22	22	34	38	3.6	1.9	127.1
Pierce	236	83	17	42	8	48	3.2	1.9	125.0
Smothers	326	91	9	23	45	29	3.5	1.4	99.0
Summer	388	75	25	13	25	53	3.6	1.8	84.2
Taylor	321	89	11	67	11	53	3.3	1.4	127.9
Tyler	275	87	13	29	26	48	3.8	1.7	126.3
Watkins	216	86	14	40	10	71	4.1	1.7	104.4
Webb	284	86	14	33	19	64	3.7	1.4	120.9
Wheatley	287	82	18	21	25	57	3.9	2.0	119.0
Wilson	294	78	22	31	28	51	3.3	1.6	114.7
Young	294	67	33	15	43	40	3.1	1.4	151.4
Average	297	81	19	31	28	47	3.6	1.7	116.1
\$3,000 to \$3,999:									
Birney	271	90	10	35	35	46	3.4	1.4	123.9
Bundy	476	85	15	33	18	46	5.4	1.7	67.7
Cleveland	314	71	29	17	42	41	3.2	1.4	127.4
Cook	284	77	23	42	27	67	3.1	1.5	133.3
Grimke	286	77	23	3	35	45	3.5	1.4	124.6
Harrison	306	76	24	33	33	61	3.3	1.3	126.3
Kenilworth	299	83	17	26	29	29	3.4	1.7	106.3
Lampton	259	-----	-----	-----	-----	61	3.6	3.3	-----
Lennox Annex	236	83	17	21	8	71	3.6	3.4	132.0
Scott	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Montgomery	281	68	32	45	38	40	3.4	1.7	129.1
Morse	354	73	27	9	36	11	4.1	1.7	102.5
Mott	418	79	21	32	43	22	3.8	1.4	97.9
Nichols	268	96	4	50	4	67	3.5	2.0	81.3
Perry	383	84	16	26	26	40	4.6	1.7	92.4
Seaton	337	85	15	0	38	14	4.7	2.0	81.3
Simmons	277	85	15	44	22	47	4.0	2.1	99.5
Slater	322	82	18	36	18	61	3.6	1.7	140.4
Syphax	275	74	26	22	37	42	3.7	1.9	95.6
Thomas	304	79	21	45	31	48	3.7	2.0	104.5
Thomson	344	70	30	33	19	64	3.9	2.0	110.0
Van Ness	250	81	19	22	25	53	3.4	1.6	100.5
Walker-Jones	293	75	25	38	28	41	3.9	1.7	99.4
Average	309	80	20	29	28	46	3.8	1.9	111.5

SCHOOL SPENDING FOR THE POOR AND THE WEALTHY

In his study of schools in metropolitan areas, "Slums and Suburbs," James B. Conant observed that the "contrast in money available to the schools in a wealthy suburb and to the schools in a large city jolts one's notions of the meaning of the equality of opportunity."¹ The expenditure per pupil in a wealthy suburban school, Dr. Conant reported, is as high as \$1,000 a year, but in a big city school, less than half that amount.

The Superintendent of the District Schools appears to challenge the applicability of Dr. Conant's study to the Washington school system. In his report on the local schools, submitted to this Task Force in October 1965, although conceding that "an apparent imbalance * * * is reported in the 1963-64 costs," Superintendent Hansen declares that "no sharp conclusions can be drawn that the regular appropriations are spent to favor the white well-to-do sections of the city."²

The Task Force has arrived at a contrary conclusion.

For all elementary District schools, the median expenditure in 1963-64 was \$295 per capita. The range was from \$216 to \$649. In a few cases, the difference in per capita spending is due to such conditions as special service programs in particular schools for children from other parts of the city and the partial use of some school buildings for administrative offices. With isolated exceptions, however, the pattern of the District school system is that the elementary schools in the affluent neighborhoods receive more money to spend for each of their students than do the schools in the lower income neighborhoods.²

Twelve elementary schools are located in areas where the median family income in 1963 was over \$10,000 a year. Ten of these schools were in the upper quartile in terms of per capita amount spent for each pupil; the remaining two in the next quartile. None of the elementary schools in the upper income neighborhoods received less than the median of \$295 for all schools. The least favored of the "affluent" schools received \$19 more than the median, or \$314, while the most favored received \$627.

Of the 58 schools in neighborhoods where the median family income was below \$5,000, only 10 were in the top quartile of per capita spending.

The median per capita spent for the schools which serve children in neighborhoods of families earning more than \$10,000 a year was \$425, almost 1½ times the city's median; the amount for the neighborhoods

¹ The funds being made available for special programs from appropriations under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, under Impacted Areas Aid Act of 1964, and from grants by the Office of Economic Opportunity are not considered here because it is conceded that these appropriations are not intended "to equalize administrative inequalities" between schools, but to "compensate for the social and economic handicaps" experienced by poor children, and are to be applied to schools where the existing appropriations are "essentially equal."

² The expenditures in senior and junior high schools indicate no correlation between per capita spending and the economic level of the surrounding neighborhoods.

with below \$5,000 family incomes was only slightly above the median for the city, \$297.

The difference in per capita spending in the elementary schools is due primarily to two factors: the size of the student body and the qualifications of the faculty. In the poorer neighborhoods, the number of pupils related to each building's capacity tends to be high and the qualifications of the teachers tend to be lower than in the other schools. Thus the proportionate expense for the building and especially for teachers' salaries, which comprise 77 percent of all operating costs, tends to be lower for these neighborhoods.

Superintendent Hansen has stated that "no deliberate advantage falls to the predominately white schools." Whether deliberate or not, the fact remains that the lower income Negro neighborhoods receive less money per elementary school child than the upper income white neighborhoods. The difference is expressed in terms of overcrowding school children into oversized classes with teachers who have inferior qualifications. This per capita difference is the difference between superior and inferior education.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Appropriations to individual schools be allocated, along with other criteria, on the basis of the relationship between the number of students in the given schools and their reading and math achievement levels with the goal of providing such additional programs as are necessary to bring their reading and math achievement levels as quickly as possible to the District norm.
2. Provide individual teachers in the poorer areas with a special account against which the teacher may draw funds on her own initiative for the purchase of those "tools" she feels she needs to give her class the materials it needs to help raise teaching standards with the least delay.
3. Eliminate the redtape which delays assignment of supplies and books requested by individual schools.

STUDENT AND TEACHER DISTRIBUTION

The proportion of Negro children in Washington's public schools has increased steadily for at least 30 years. It had risen from approximately one-third in 1926 to more than 60 percent in 1954, when the Supreme Court declared segregated schools unconstitutional. Since the abolition of the dual school systems maintained for Negro and for white children, the number of Negroes in the school population has risen to 90 percent in 1965, and 93 percent thus far in 1966.

For most of Washington's schoolchildren, segregation remains a fact of their daily lives. If we define segregated schools as those having 85 percent or more of one race, accepted by the Superintendent of Schools as "not unreasonable," then most schools in the District are segregated—either segregated nonwhite or segregated white. There are 138 segregated Negro schools and 11 segregated white schools. Only 25 show a racial composition balanced at a better level than the 85 to 14 ratio. Of the 137 elementary schools, only 18 are integrated. Three of twenty-five junior highs and 3 of 11 senior high schools are integrated institutions. One of the five vocational schools is integrated.

A larger proportion of the secondary school students are enrolled in integrated institutions than is the case for the elementary school children.

The problem for Washington, perhaps more so than in most other large cities, is how to achieve a better balance in the school system with such an uneven racial distribution among its school age children. But such distribution has not been a criterion in the decisions made by the Board of Education. It has not been a factor in selecting sites for the construction of new schools, in the establishment of boundary lines for schools, in balancing school enrollments with building capacity within reasonable distances, or in the assignment of teachers and administrative personnel.

A starting point for an imaginative and creative approach to the difficult problem of securing a better school system for the District of Columbia must be a thoroughgoing study of possible means.

The present Task Force on the District schools has not had the conduct of such a study as its function. Nonetheless, its examination of the problem indicates that there are programs which are open but presently ignored by the school authorities, to achieve a measure of more equitable distribution of students.

Assuming that "neighborhood schools" are the primary method of serving elementary school children, the choice of site can be used to reduce segregated schools only in neighborhoods where Negroes and whites live in adjoining areas. Such communities exist on Capitol Hill, in the Southwest, along East Capitol Street and in the Adams-Morgan area, among other sections of Washington. Here, as the Amidon experience bears witness, the location of a modern school plant with well-qualified teachers can promote better balance in the school environment.

With a 93-percent nonwhite school population, it can readily be understood why there is such a high rate of segregated schooling in the District. Obviously you cannot have integrated schools without white children in the District. But the Board cannot escape its responsibility for permitting District schools to reach such abominable conditions that white "families who can afford to move" have abandoned the District, seeking better schooling for their children in surrounding suburbs. Nor can Congress itself be absolved from its surrender of responsibility to allow such conditions to develop in the District.

TEACHER SEGREGATION

With almost 25 percent of the classroom teachers, counselors, librarians, psychologists, and speech correctionists being white, the racial separation of such teaching personnel is even more pronounced than for the pupils in the District school system. This, despite the fact that Superintendent Hansen has declared: "Teachers * * * are assigned where needed rather than on race * * * Negro teachers are often assigned to predominantly white schools and vice versa."

If there were a random distribution of teachers, without regard to race, every school would have both Negro and white teachers. They do not.

In 1964, 18 elementary schools had virtually all-white faculties. Fourteen of them did not have a single Negro teacher; the other four had one Negro teacher each. There were 65 elementary school buildings in which there was not a single white teacher. Disregarding small annexes in each of which fewer than 10 teachers served, another 27 schools had only 1 or 2 white teachers each. One hundred and three schools had less than a 15 percent proportion of either race. The Superintendent's claim that "the Board of Education and the school administration have pursued a positive and aggressive course of action in the placement of teachers * * * to achieve biracial staffing," is obviously without support from records of the school system.

In effect, 8 out of 10 elementary schools were, by any reasonable criteria, segregated institutions.

At the junior high school level half the schools were segregated. Of these, two had white teachers, while the others had two, three, or four white teachers. Nine of the eleven senior high schools were well integrated, but one white school had only 5.5 percent Negro professionals in a faculty of 59, while a Negro school had four whites in a faculty of 78. Among the vocational schools three were well integrated, while two others were almost completely Negro in their staff.

There can be no doubt that Negro youngsters too often are denied the benefits of teaching by more experienced and better prepared white teachers. The poverty cycle is even further perpetuated with this type of gross discrimination in distribution of teaching staffs. But more tragically, the gifted Negro student—and the committee met many of these—is denied an opportunity to develop his resources to the fullest by being denied access to the more experienced teachers because of this kind of segregation of teaching staffs.

The Task Force recognizes that to try to forcefully transfer teachers into schools against their will may strip the District completely of its remaining experienced teachers who now exercise their seniority rights in selecting their assignments. The surrounding suburbs with their teacher shortages, remain as a lure for District teachers. But there is no record that the Board has taken any appreciable steps to encourage voluntary acceptance by more experienced teachers for assignments to schools badly in need of such teachers. There is evi-

dence that properly motivated teachers would accept such assignments voluntarily.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Provide the District of Columbia with a school system so excellent that the flight of white families from the District can be curtailed.
2. Provide a system of classroom aides to teachers in title I (poverty area) schools so that a teacher can devote more individual time with each of her students while the classroom aide maintains order with the rest of the class.
3. Relieve teachers of the mountain of nonteaching paperwork which denies her an opportunity to spend more time with her students.
4. Provide an incentive plan which would encourage experienced teachers to accept assignments in low income, title I areas.
5. Strive for better understanding in so-called peripheral or changing areas for greater balance in schools.
6. Provide special inservice training programs for teachers in their respective schools so that the less experienced teacher can be brought up to the needs of the school in which she is teaching with minimal delay.
7. Hire teachers who voluntarily accept assignments in Title I schools (poverty areas) on a 12-month basis so they can work their normal 10 months plus working in Headstart or other summer programs the other 2 months. Putting teachers on a 12-month basis, at least in the poverty areas, would attract the more experienced teacher on a voluntary basis into the areas of greatest need.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Vocational education in Washington's public schools is provided in five vocational high schools and, through the offering of selected vocational subjects, in most of the senior high schools.

Some 2,900 students are enrolled in the vocational schools. They receive course offerings for approximately 47 trades. Of the total class enrollment of 8,160, more than a third are in secretarial courses, 269 in construction trades, 900 in industrial, and 1,100 in miscellaneous trades.

In the senior high schools, of approximately 17,000 course enrollments in vocational subjects (one student may be enrolled in several courses), nearly 11,000 are in business subjects of whom 4,000 are in typing, approximately 3,000 in industrial and mechanical courses, and another 3,100 are in home economics courses.

The most critical problem of the vocational schools has been the lack of space. The result has been a denial of vocational training opportunities for hundreds of applicants and insufficient preparation for those who are enrolled.

One school was able to admit only 320 of its 762 applicants, another had space for only 265 of the 587 who sought admission. Students who seek particular courses also are turned away. More than 100 applicants for training in secretarial and business courses, a shortage occupation in Washington, were refused enrollment for lack of space.

For those who are enrolled, the facilities are inadequate. Four of the five schools are overcapacity. In some buildings, there is no room for new equipment for which funds are available. Many students are unable to take the vocational course they choose or need because of the number of overcrowded classes. One school has a single science laboratory for 739 students.

As a solution to the shortage of space, as well as to various other problems of vocational education, the Board of Education has recommended the construction of a vocation-technical-occupational center, which would provide a consolidated plant with a capacity for 5,000 students. In view of the fact that the present buildings combine obsolescence with acute overcrowding, the construction of a new plant is amply justified based solely upon the requirements for the present year. With certain expansion of student enrollment and with increasing demand for technical training to meet the requirements of industry, the proposed center is a compelling need for the District schools.

Where space has permitted, funds from the Vocational Education Act of 1963 have modernized much of the equipment in Washington's vocational high schools. Most of it will be up to date with the additional changes to be made during the next 2 years.

Criticism has been made that the techniques and training given in vocational courses in senior high schools and in courses of the vocational high schools are not closely related to the needs of the labor market.

In the comprehensive high school, the vocational courses offered are mostly exploratory and general. They are usually too superficial to provide saleable skills. A review of the vocational curriculum in these schools should be conducted to determine the possibility of

providing more intensive training. Not only must the education of these schools be made more thorough in the subjects offered, but it must be more extensive. One of the major demands in industry in the metropolitan area of Washington is for persons who are trained in technical fields which require a greater knowledge in general educational subjects, especially in mathematics and the sciences, than has been offered in the vocational high schools.

In order for the schools to be flexible and responsive to changes occurring in the labor market, industry advisory committees must be established. Effective use of such committees, which are required by the Vocational Education Act of 1963 to review curriculum in trade subjects, to examine equipment, and to counsel in the teaching of techniques, is an essential. Yet, with the exception of one large group which at best meets a few times a year and an advisory group in one or two skill areas, no committees now exist to permit continuous collaboration between the schools and labor and industry.

Demand for labor has shifted in the postwar years to a higher level of skills, yet the attitude toward vocational education among general high school students is such that the vocational schools, realistically, look to the two lower tracks as a source for vocational enrollments.

Most of these students need remedial programs in reading and in math, yet there is only one remedial reading teacher in each of four vocational high schools, and none in the fifth.

Without improvement in their basic skills, students continue to have little interest in school, are unable to benefit from much of the vocational program being offered and drop out of the educational process altogether.

Counseling, which is regarded as one of the essential activities toward the prevention of school dropouts, is conducted upon the most inadequate basis. The ratios recommended for vocational high schools by various professional groups range from 1 counselor for 250 students to 1 for 350. The Board of Education has approved a ratio of 1 counselor to 400 vocational students. Except for 1 school with 2 counselors, however, the schools each have 1 counselor and heavily overburden him with ratios which range between 1 to 739 to 1 to 426.

Apart from the small number of counselors, the qualifications of counselors who are employed bear little relation to the many functions which they must perform.

Few, if any, of the counselors are trained in placement. They have little experience or orientation in employment counseling related to the opportunities available for trades taught in the schools. Neither are they equipped to deal with the many other problems which cause young people to leave school before graduation.

For every 100 students who enter Washington's vocational high schools in the 10th grade, it is estimated that 60 are not there on graduation day. Although the school system has undertaken a variety of projects to reduce the number of dropouts and to provide continued education for those who have left school, the programs in the vocational schools have been very limited.

Work-study programs which permit a student to combine school with work in supervised on-the-job training involve only between 5 and 10 percent of the vocational students. The establishment of a central placement office would permit an expansion of work-study arrangements, as it would help in the placement of students leaving the schools before and after graduation.

Arrangements for job placement are often solely dependent upon the teachers, already overburdened with heavy teaching loads. Placement, nevertheless, is successful for many of the vocational high school graduates. About 90 percent find jobs, and most of them, it is estimated, find jobs in trades for which they were trained, or in closely related areas.

Placement of vocational high school graduates has posed no problem for white students. Yet school officials note that there is resistance to the employment of Negro students, not only in private industry; but, it was stated, in various Government agencies as well. One highly placed vocational school official knowing of such probable violations of the District of Columbia fair employment practice regulation on the part of private employers and of Federal laws and regulations on the part of Government agencies accepted no responsibility for reporting the violations to the proper authorities.

Indifference to discrimination because of race, religion, or national origin obviously should not be tolerated in any agency of the Government. In a vocational high school, the very purpose of which is to secure appropriate employment for qualified students, such indifference constitutes shocking disregard for the law.

It is incumbent upon the Superintendent of Schools to take corrective action to compel the reporting of all instances of racial or other illegal discrimination in employment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That a vocational-technical-occupational center be established for Washington. The center should be designed to enhance the quality of vocational education, to attract students with a wider range of aptitudes, and to provide both more intensive and more extensive training for the skills needed in a modern technology.
2. That a coordinated team approach be developed in order to assure the completion of high school by every entering student, namely:
 - (a) That the number of counselors in the vocational high schools be increased so that there is a ratio of 1 counselor for at least every 300 students.
 - (b) That auxiliary personnel be employed, including social case-workers, psychiatric social workers, and placement counselors to assist in resolving problems of students which may affect the completion of their education.
3. That the curriculum and teaching techniques used for vocational education in both the vocational high schools and in the senior high schools be reviewed to assure that they are suitable for present occupational requirements.
4. That industry-labor-school committees be established for each trade and utilized to provide continuing collaboration in dealing with the teaching of vocational subjects and placement of students.
5. That cooperative work-study arrangements be greatly expanded both to provide on-the-job training and to permit needy students to earn money while they learn.
6. That the vocational schools report any apparent violations of fair employment laws to the appropriate District and Federal authorities.

READING

Without question, the most critical problem facing Washington's public schools has been their failure to teach most of the city's pupils how to read effectively.

The extent of this problem is starkly and graphically revealed by the reading achievement level of the schoolchildren shown by grades in the table below:

[In percent]

Grade	Read at grade level	Read at 1 or more years below grade level
At grade 3	67.2	32.8
At grade 4	37.3	62.7
At grade 5	50.6	39.4
At grade 6	54.6	45.4
At grade 8	45.5	54.5

A school system which reduces 67.2 percent of its children who read at grade level or above in the third grade to 45.5 percent who read below grade level by the eighth grade, and which increases the number who read below grade level from 32.8 to 54.5 percent in the same period, has an obligation to examine the causes and to reappraise its teaching methods.

No other factor in the entire school program contributes more to a person's remaining in poverty than his inability to read.

There is no evidence of such a reexamination although in the past 2 years the schools have undertaken a considerable program to overcome reading retardation.

A remedial reading clinic with 36 specialists serves 34 centers in the elementary schools and 14 centers in the secondary schools and provides diagnostic and instructional assistance to children, as well as inservice training and other aids for teachers. The beneficiaries of this program are primarily children who appear to have special psychological or other problems which interfere with their ability to read.

A massive program has been conducted for nearly 11,500 elementary school children who are from 1 to more than 3 years behind the normal reading levels for their age. One group, comprising 882 fourth, fifth, and sixth grades in 31 schools, is given intensive training to overcome severe reading retardation. A second group of some 10,000 children in 54 elementary schools is given more than the usual classroom time for reading experience.

A further program for 7,200 children in kindergarten through the third grade in 14 schools is intended to develop the language arts, speaking and writing, as well as reading by various methods.

Other approaches include the formation of a junior primary grade between kindergarten and first grade for children whose reading readiness is below normal; the assignment of some children to ungraded classrooms where they are grouped according to their reading levels; and summer school courses in remedial reading.

The question remains whether these programs are adequate to deal with a problem which is as acute as the reading retardation in Washington's schools.

In terms of numbers of students, the schools have made great strides toward the inclusion in remedial programs of the elementary school children who require them. The reading clinic has performed diagnostic and screening services for many children. Fourteen hundred received special instruction, while 465 who were diagnosed were unable to get the special instruction they needed for lack of adequate staff.

The 11,500 children involved in special reading programs in the elementary schools comprise roughly two-thirds of all the children who read below their grade level.

However, relatively little emphasis has been given to the reading problems of secondary school students. At the end of the eighth grade, for example, approximately 4,600 students are more than 1 year (814) and 2 years or more (3,788) below grade level in reading achievement. Yet, except for assignment of slightly more than 1,000 ninth grade students to the basic track, which is supposed to be remedial, no special programs have been undertaken to overcome the reading deficiencies of these high school students. The Vicors program at Cardoza High School in the model school division represents one of the few remedial reading projects at the senior high school level. The problem is made the more acute because few high school teachers have been given training to teach basic skills, such as reading, which children are supposed to acquire in elementary schools.

Apart from the number of children reached by the remedial reading programs, the question whether the programs have been effective remains unanswered.

Remedial instruction in the elementary school has been handicapped because of the continuation of oversized classes, the shortage of teachers with specialized training in remedial reading, and a lack of reading materials appropriate to the age of the children. Except for testing done with children in the language arts project through the third grade, the school administration, for lack of funds, has conducted no research to determine the efficacy of its reading programs.

In view of the enormity of the problem and the uncertainty of the answers, what seems needed is a multifaceted approach using the widest variety of experimental programs, all subject to testing for their effectiveness. It is not too much to urge that the school system adopt a crash program to eliminate functional illiteracy. The war against poverty must begin with a battle to achieve the ability to read.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The adoption of a many-phased approach to the problem of reading retardation, with the use of a variety of experimental methods.
2. Expansion of remedial reading programs to include all elementary and secondary pupils who are retarded in their reading levels.
3. Improvement of the programs to eliminate oversized classes, provide appropriate reading materials, and obtain qualified teachers.
4. The development of a systematic program of research and testing to establish the efficacy of the remedial methods used.
5. Vast expansion of the Headstart program to cover more children in District schools.

LIBRARIES

Libraries perform a critical role in the education of children by promoting a taste and a habit for reading, by complementing and reinforcing classroom instruction, and by proving a stimulus for self-learning. The need for library facilities, Superintendent Hansen has told Congress, is "extraordinarily important" for elementary school children.

Yet, school libraries in the District of Columbia are administered with a haphazard budget, without imaginative use of the resources available, and without concern for the special need of providing reading stimulus for children whose homes provide no cultural or educational enrichment.

Every senior and junior high school in Washington employs full-time professional librarians. But of the 137 elementary schools, only 26 have such librarians.¹ The aim of the public schools was stated in the hearings on the 1966 appropriations to be 110 positions, providing for 1 librarian for each "administrative unit" in the elementary school system. By comparison, the minimum standards of the American Library Association would require 300 librarians for the 90,000 elementary school children in Washington's public schools.

Despite both the ALA stated minimal requirement for 300 librarians and the public schools' more modest requirement of 110 librarians, the total number of elementary school librarians requested by school officials in the 1966-67 budget proposals was only 67.

Given the shortage of professionally trained librarians, the public schools must accept responsibility for the failure to provide adequate library services to those children who are most in need of the stimulus which books provide.

When Congress first appropriated funds for the employment of 16 librarians in the elementary schools in the 1964-65 school year, the schools placed *every* librarian in schools where library services were *already* being furnished by experienced volunteers. Thus, when presented with the opportunity to double the number of elementary schools which could receive library services, a school administration, heavily influenced by doctrines of "professionalism," wasted an asset—the volunteer—which it had previously used to great advantage and thus deliberately restricted the number of children for whom library facilities could be made available.²

The impact of the shortage of library facilities is felt most in the city's areas of poverty-stricken families. Superintendent Hansen gave public recognition of the need himself when he told a Senate Appropriations subcommittee that "where library services are most needed, they are often least available," and that "the public schools must make up the deficiencies of hundreds of bookless homes."

¹ Librarians are employed; two serve two schools each on a half-time basis. By January 1966 an additional 20 librarians will be employed in the elementary schools.

² That the decision was deliberate is indicated by the fact that the school administration rejected the request of parents in one school, in an all-white and affluent neighborhood, that the professional librarian assigned to that school be transferred to a school without existing library services.

However, in its assignment of professional librarians to the elementary schools, the school administration has given no special focus to the additional need for library facilities in the neighborhoods with "bookless homes." Of the 24 librarians serving in the elementary schools in the fall term of 1965, only 10 are in schools located in poverty areas and are eligible for assistance under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. As a result of the school administration's distribution of professional librarians and of its policy of discouraging volunteers, 39 of the 49 elementary schools in poverty areas as defined above are without professional librarians. The children who are bookless at home remain bookless, except for their textbooks, in their public schools.

The lack of space in the older schools has been given as a reason for failing to provide them with library facilities. If the public schools are to fulfill their responsibility for encouraging reading, the administration cannot dismiss its obligation with this justification. The use of bookmobiles, of neighborhood rental space for libraries, the promotion of book fairs, an expansion of the use of "book baskets" from the public libraries to more than four times a year, frequent public library visits, as well as other techniques, are available to resourceful and imaginative school librarians.

The school administration's failure to deal adequately with the greater needs of the poverty-afflicted areas is underscored in the distribution of books even within the schools which have libraries. The allocation of money for the purchase of books is based upon the per capita enrollment in each school. This apparent equality of treatment of schools and the children in them ignores the manifest inequality of the availability of books to children in Washington's diverse neighborhoods. A junior high school in an upper income neighborhood of families with relatively high educational backgrounds and with "books in the house" had a library of 5,600 books in the fall of 1965. A junior high school in a neighborhood with a high incidence of welfare clients and other low-income families with limited schooling and with "no books in the house," had 3,500 books for 1,400 children. The former had five complete sets of encyclopedia, with additional sets in various classrooms; the latter had one. Similarly, at one elementary school "feeding" into the affluent junior high school, the home and school association had provided 12 sets of an encyclopedia, while in the less favored neighborhoods there are schools with not a single set. Yet each of the schools receive an identical per capita allocation for books, 50 cents for elementary schools, \$1 for junior and senior high schools.

Libraries, it should not need to be said, have no purpose in a school other than to be used. Here again, the difference between the school in the affluent neighborhood and the one in the poor area was most dramatic. In the more favored junior high school, more than 100 children used the library daily; the less favored area, fewer than 20.

A major reason for this disparity is the failure of the school library administration to recognize a responsibility for more vigorously encouraging the use of the library. Its concerns have had more to do with the acquisition and the processing of books, and the construction of catalogs and maintenance of records than with interesting children in the importance and excitement of books and what is in them.

Especially for children whose homes have no books, whose parents are themselves barely literate, do the school librarians, together with the classroom teachers, have the duty to arouse an interest in books and the facility to use a library.

The short of it is that the present library administration in Washington's schools lacks a dynamic approach to its tasks. There is an urgent need to translate Superintendent Hansen's acknowledgment of the function of the public schools in promoting the use of books into a program of activity for the classroom teacher and for the school librarian. While it is true that Congress in the past has failed to provide sufficient funds to provide for adequate library facilities and has not yet met the full needs of the District schools, approximately \$350,000 has become available recently under title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Unless the school library administration adopts a more purposeful approach to the children in deprived neighborhoods, it will fail to achieve the goals which the schools must meet.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Reorganization of the library services administration in the schools to include liaison with teachers, public librarians, parents, and volunteer community groups.
2. Establishment of the position of liaison librarian between the public libraries and the schools.
3. Coordinated training and use of volunteers.
4. Expanded training and employment of library aides for all schools where volunteers are not available.
5. Allocation of space in every school for library purposes, whether in the school building, with the use of bookmobiles, or with the use of other facilities.
6. Special emphasis on developing library services in poverty-affected neighborhoods.
7. A dynamic approach to the development of techniques for stimulating an interest in books.
8. Wider use of students hired by the Neighborhood Youth Corps to assist librarians.
9. Establish an "indexing pool" with use of funds from the Library Services Act to process new books so they are ready for immediate use when shipped to individual schools.

THE TRACK SYSTEM

INTRODUCTION

As this subcommittee examined poverty in the District of Columbia, it inevitably examined what is considered today the major escape route for the poor and poverty stricken—education. In examining education in the District of Columbia, the subcommittee walked into the feuding grounds presently occupied by the antitrack groups and the Hansen track defenders. Both sides were heard in testimony before the subcommittee in October. Calls for change ranged from firing Dr. Hansen and abolishing the track system and “ability grouping” to modifying the track system, improving its application, or shifting its emphasis. Track supporters called for more substantial financial support of Dr. Hansen and his track program. The extent of the opposition to the track system is difficult to assess; both antitrackers and protrackers claim strong sentiment in the community.

Much was said on both sides during the hearings and much additional data have been collected. Much more data, not easily collectible, are needed to make a solid judgment on the worth of the track system in the District of Columbia over other kinds of grouping or eliminating any type of grouping. The Task Force, within its limited facilities, concludes consideration should be given to either dropping the track system or severely rewriting it.

Presumably the study to be done by an outside group will provide the type of data needed to make a final decision; Dr. Hansen has said if such a study produces the judgment that the track system should be abolished, he will abolish it.

Still, the material collected by the subcommittee, when sorted out and examined alongside the aims and assumptions of the poverty program, does allow for some pertinent observations, and does draw out some provocative questions for the study group to consider.

TRACK FACTS

The four-track system, originated by Dr. Carl Hansen and presented to the District of Columbia Board of Education during his first year as Superintendent, began in 1956 in the 10th grade. The following year it was extended to the 11th grade and in 1958 to 12th grade.

In 1959, the junior high school grades and the elementary grades were brought under the three-track system—honors, general, and basic, leaving out college preparatory.

Before the track system was installed, an intensive-extensive grouping of pupils was used in white senior high schools, and also in Negro senior high schools; some white junior high school principals acknowledged using ability grouping, and so did those in Negro junior high schools. There were no systemwide criteria for such grouping; if a school practiced it, the pupils were sorted into groups according to

the discretion of the principal. At elementary level, a variety of theories and practices went on in most Negro and white systems, but if a school had more than one section of a grade, there was a tendency to organize a high and a low group.

How much the program differed between one ability group and another is uncertain. The requirements for graduation were 16 Carnegie units, which had to include 4 units of English, 1 of math, 1 of science, and $1\frac{1}{2}$ of history. The other $8\frac{1}{2}$ could be whatever the pupil selected from any department.

When the Negro and white school systems were merged in 1954-55, it soon became apparent that each had been using different curricula, methods, policies, and financial resources, and that achievement levels in the Negro schools were noticeably below those of the white schools.

The tracking proposal, with its definite citywide criteria for sorting pupils according to ability and achievement, offered the white community — including Congress which controlled funds for the schools — reassurance about the possible downgrading effect that desegregation might have on District of Columbia education. The tracking proposal also informed the Negro community that in the standardizing of policy throughout the unified system, Negro pupils would be measured by the same tests as white pupils, all pupils would be sorted according to the same cutoff scores, and all would be expected to have the same programs. The tracking proposal held a promise for help in meeting the sizable needs of Negro pupils, particularly those at the bottom of the scale.

The definite, publicly announced measuring sticks and cutoff scores of IQ and achievement for each track, and the track labels for pupils within those measured bounds, made the definition of "ability grouping" quite exact for the top and bottom groups. The great middle group of "generals" could be sorted into streams specializing in various types of training (business, shop, academic, etc.) and into groups within those groups. Requirements for graduation for college-bound honors pupils were raised to 18, with electives almost eliminated.

From a chart prepared by the school system showing the distribution by tracks of pupils in the senior high schools from fall 1958 through fall 1965, the following conclusions can be drawn:

(1) Basic track in grades 10, 11, and 12 has decreased in size steadily and substantially (15 points) in 8 years. In percentages, its decrease is from $22\frac{1}{2}$ percent to not quite 8 percent, despite the rise in total senior high enrollment from about 13,000 to over 18,000, and a great change in racial composition from 70 percent in 1956 to 93 percent in 1966.

(2) The honors track, after rising from 6.7 to 8.1 percent over 5 years, has declined this year to 5.5 percent.

(3) While the basic track has gone down 15 points, and the honors about 1 point, the general track has gone up 9 points and the regular (college prep) track, 7 points.

In the junior high schools, figures from Dr. Hansen's "Review of the Track System (January 1964)" show the basic track at that level gradually increasing in size from 12 percent in 1959 to 15.5 percent in 1963, then back to 14.4 percent in fall 1964 and a bigger drop in the fall of 1965 to 9.7 percent (2,767 pupils). It is not clear if the drop this year is a result of Dr. Hansen's policy statements that basic

track should include no remedial normal pupils but only mentally retarded pupils, that principals may not make administrative assignments without tests, and that parents could veto basic track placement.

The drop probably was not a result of a "massive, crash-testing" program that drew newspaper headlines in September 1965, since this September's crash testing of backlogged referrals of this kind involved fewer pupils than September crash-testing programs in previous years. Out of this year's 1,273 cases, about half were at junior high level, the other half at elementary level.

In junior high school honors track, the Superintendent's report gives figures showing an increase from 4.8 percent in 1959 to 6.2 percent in 1964. Honors in fall 1965 were 6 percent.

Elementary school figures from the Superintendent's report lists basic track as 3.2 percent in 1959 and 3.7 percent in 1964. In fall 1965 the figure was 3.1 percent (2,495 pupils). Presumably this does not include any pupils removed in the September crash testing.

It should be noted that track figures are as of October of a school year; with administrative assignments occurring throughout the year and long delays in testing so that from 1,000 to 2,000 are backlogged by June, it seems likely that the percentage of elementary and junior high basics in spring would be quite a bit higher than the figure taken from the October count.

Basic classes at all levels appear to be concentrated in certain schools. In response to a questionnaire from Citizens for Better Public Education, 10 elementary principals said that the basic track in their schools included from 9 to 41 percent of the pupils; 43 other principals said basic track in their schools included from 6 percent to none of their pupils.

Pressures opposing the track system, particularly its lower sections, have been building up for years. More than 2 years ago, School Board Member Louise Steele suggested a special committee should be set up to study the basic track and clarify it for those who had questions. A few months later, an "all-level committee on basic education" submitted a short report, summarizing current policy, and making 12 recommendations to implement it. These recommendations implied weakness at every point cited by critics.

Pressure continued to mount during the next year and a half, with dissatisfaction expressed at Board of Education meetings, primarily by Dr. Euphemia Haynes, and in public meetings by religious and civic leaders in the Negro community.

The majority of complaints were about the confusion over who is supposed to be in the basic track and who is actually there; about whether the basic track is a "dumping ground"; about what is supposed to be going on in basic classes and what is, in fact, going on; about whether a pupil placed in basic track can ever expect to get enough learning to test score out; about whether labels are harmful to pupil ego and morale; about whether there should be any tracking at elementary level. Complaints have extended to the general track, with questions rising about the accuracy of the measure of the poorer pupils of the tests used reflect a life they are not familiar with; about the leanness of the program resulting in capable general track pupils' being ineligible for college.

Primarily, the protesters include individual parents, civic organizations, teacher and parent groups, civil rights organizations, social work

organizations, special interest groups, religious organizations, labor organizations, and fraternal organizations according to a list of speakers at an antitrack meeting in July 1965.

TESTING AND PLACEMENT

Ability grouping of large masses of pupils, especially where there are precise dividing lines of IQ and achievement scores between one group and another, is dependent on testing. For the track system, the placement officers need to know a definite score on the knowledge accumulated by the student and information regarding his background and personality.

For group testing of intelligence and achievement, the Department of Pupil Personnel is in charge of choosing the tests, distributing them to the schools, supplying guidance to teachers and principals about giving them, getting them scored, charting the results class by class for the use of the teacher and principal. The class scores can also be used to spot weaknesses in the teaching program, and at one time the former testing director attempted to interest administrators and teachers in doing this, without success.

Last year group intelligence and achievement tests handled by 23 testers and 11 clerks numbered close to 500,000 for 137,000 pupils. Most were sent back to the manufacturer for scoring by machine. About 212,000 of these for 43,000 pupils were special to this year's workload, made at the request of Dr. Hansen for a 10-year comparison with tests used at the beginning of the track system but not used now.

In addition to the group IQ and achievement tests, the testing department provided psychological services to nearly 6,000 pupils, including basic track referrals, and special class referrals. It also gave psychiatric help to 334 pupils; 1 psychiatrist attended them all. To give psychological tests to basics and special referrals, the 23 testing psychologists go personally to the schools where the pupils are. About 80 percent of all such testing was at elementary level in 1964-65 according to Department figures.

In fall 1965 much publicity was given to a September "crash testing" of pupils who had been placed by principals in basic track during the previous year and who, because of lack of testing personnel, had not been given an individual psychological test. According to Pupil Personnel, the numbers were 653 elementary pupils and 620 junior high pupils. Of these, test results showed 441 belonged in basic classes.

Actually the 1,273 referrals that had accumulated for "crash testing" this September were much less than they have been in previous years, the pupil personnel department says. An increase of staff (from impacted area funds), and a part of the staff working during the summer for the first time, accounted for this reduction.

With the Superintendent's directive in the fall that no child could be placed in basic without prior testing by pupil personnel, the workload of testers has become more pressing, and again they are months behind in reaching children that principals judge should be taken out of the regular classrooms.

For the pupils about to be tested, and whose future training is dependent on how well they do on the test, the details of the testing

procedure are important. It has been observed, for example, that with young children particularly it makes a difference who gives the test, whether the child has ever had any experience with such tests, his emotional state at the time, what is said to him about the purpose of the test and its importance. It matters, too, what the physical surroundings are—the lighting, the amount and type of noise, the physical comfort, the movement of other people, interruptions.

Children usually take the fateful tests in a group under their own teacher, who may know a little or much about testing, be new or experienced at teaching. They usually take the tests in their own classroom, which may be new and well-equipped, a screened off part of the auditorium, a basement corner, or a wide hallway.

Pupils being considered for placement in basic track are privately interviewed in their own schools for a psychologist from Pupil Personnel. This individual test is either verbal or nonverbal or both, and yields an IQ score, because placement in basic (special academic) is prescribed only for children below 75 IQ. In elementary schools, no regular, group IQ test is given until fourth grade. Basic pupils are not included.

Both achievement and ability tests are shipped off to the manufacturer for machine scoring, and are usually returned within 3 weeks. During the next 2 or 3 weeks, the testing department's 23 psychologists and 11 clerks make a chart for each class, showing for each pupil the score on his mental ability test and the scores in each subject area of the achievement tests. The score charts are returned to the school for use by principal, counselor, and teacher about 6 or 7 weeks after the tests are given.

In the elementary schools, metropolitan (form R) reading readiness tests are given in kindergarten or first grade, and on the basis of these scores, pupils are sorted into "ready to read" first grade groups, or "not ready" junior primary groups. Critics have attacked the "junior primary" as the beginning of basic track grouping; they claim that school officials or principals set ceilings on how much can be taught them, and that as a result needy pupils never reach the "ready" point, but are doomed to basic classes for the rest of their school life. School officials declare that the junior primary was devised only as a means of giving needy pupils an extra year to catch up, to make success in first grade more certain; a strong junior primary program is outlined in the Amidon plan charts. The two conflicting claims indicate a gap between paper plan and actuality, at least in some schools. Research among the junior primary teachers would be required to find out the facts.

Principal responses to a questionnaire sent them by Citizens for Better Education this fall indicate that basic classes in a number of schools include children removed from kindergarten, first, and second grades. The criteria for removing them from regular classes seems at first to have been principal-teacher judgment; later, to principal-teacher judgment confirmed by an individual psychological test administered by pupil personnel perhaps weeks or months afterward; since a few months ago, the principal cannot move a child to basic without a prior test by Pupil Personnel.

With honors classes prescribed to begin in the fourth grade, testing of honors candidates is carried out in the third. Candidates are selected by teachers and principals.

In the past school year, the California Tests of Mental Maturity, S-Form 1H, was administered in February to 1,385 third grade pupils. To qualify for honors, a pupil needs a score of 120 IQ and above grade level achievement.

With no testing given to other children in the third grade, the implication is that general track fourth grade pupils are organized into homogeneous groups on the basis of teacher-principal-counselor judgment, just as they have been in grades one through three.

The first big testing of elementary pupils takes place in January of the fourth grade. Both a mental ability test (Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Test, Alpha AS, and a battery of achievement tests (Metropolitan Achievement Test, Elementary Battery, Form A) were given last school year. Pupils not working in the regular classes but located in basic or special academic groups, are not tested. Whether these test scores result in any transfers into or out of honors track is not indicated; whether IQ and achievement scores cause shifts in pupil placement among the grade sections of general track is also not indicated. The question arises as to why these tests are not given to all pupils in the third grade, instead of the fourth, preparatory to tracking.

The question also arises as to whether children placed in ungraded classes at primary level on the basis of one individual psychological test remain there without further retesting until such time as teacher or principal calls for a new test. How is their achievement measured during this time? In the February 1964 report of the Council for Exceptional Children, it is stated that about 58 percent of a group of District of Columbia teachers of basic classes (levels unspecified), indicated that they used no method of evaluation or were not aware of any method of evaluation being used in their buildings.

The second and last testing of elementary school pupils takes place in March of the sixth grade, and it is on the basis of these scores that pupils are placed in junior high school tracks. The Stanford Achievement Test, Intermediate II, Partial Battery, form W, and the Otis Quick-scoring Mental Ability Test, Beta, form EM, are given to all sixth-graders except the basic pupils. The basics take the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Elementary, form A (the same one that nonbasics took in fourth grade), and tests of general ability, four to six (TOGA), form A, a nonverbal test of general ability.

Several questions arise here in regard to the selection of tests. For charting pupil progress, are the Metropolitan Achievement Test scores of fourth-graders comparable to Stanford test scores of sixth grade? Why are third-grade pupils who are selected as candidates for honors track given the California Test of Mental Maturity, while the whole group the next year and in sixth grade is given the Otis Mental Ability Test?

Why not give the nonverbal TOGA test to the general track pupils, too, at least in schools in poverty areas? The Otis Mental Ability has been described by testers outside the District of Columbia schools as completely verbal, and, therefore, not an appropriate, accurate measure of the true ability of culturally depressed children.

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

The sixth-grade test scores come back to the elementary principal and teacher about the middle of March. On the basis of these scores, plus grades, and teacher-principal judgment, a recommendation is made in the record of each pupil as to the best track placement for him, and the record forwarded at the end of the school year to the junior high school principal and counselor.

Counselors and principals work during the summer sorting the incoming seventh-graders into tracks and sections of courses within tracks. Parents of pupils placed in honors are notified since their permission must be granted. Since this fall, parents of pupils placed in basic (pupils with IQ below 75) are to be notified and permission granted in writing in accord with Dr. Hansen's new directive.

Parents, according to printed policy, have always had the right to protest the placement of their child in basic or regular track. Relatively few did, or do, however. Most parents of poverty area pupils would feel themselves incapable of arguing the point, even if they were aware of it. Still, if a parent insisted, trial placement of a basic pupil was supposed to be granted. Parents of a child placed in regular track who wanted a chance for him to try honors could appeal to the principal; failing there he could appeal to the Assistant Superintendent in charge of secondary schools.

Placement in basic was mandatory until this fall, if a pupil had scored below 75 on the sixth-grade mental ability test (an Otis score for all except elementary basics and a TOGA score for them). Until this year, it was also mandatory for any pupil scoring 3 years or more below grade level in achievement.

All pupils not placed in honors or basic are regular track pupils, and are sorted according to ability and achievement into homogeneous groups. All pupils in a group will take the same courses together. No cross-tracking for courses is permitted in junior high school.

Changes from one track to another throughout junior high years must necessarily be based on sixth-grade IQ scores, junior high grades, teacher-counselor-principal judgment, with no reference to new standardized achievement or ability tests since there are none. The one junior high standardized set of tests occurs about the 1st of November in the ninth grade, with scores returning normally about Christmas vacation. Sometime between then and the end of the school year, the counselor interviews the pupil, discusses his scores with him, and his possible placement and program in senior high school for the next year. Prior to this interview, the counselor may or may not have had direct contact with the pupil. In a school where one counselor has until this fall served as many as a thousand pupils, the "get acquainted" meeting was often a group meeting. If the pupil had no questions or problems about his program from year to year, he might not volunteer to visit the counselor, nor be summoned to confer with her.

The achievement tests for honors and regular pupils in the ninth grade are entirely different from those taken two and a half years before. The Sequential Tests of Educational Progress (STEP), level 3B, presently used, measure achievement; the School and College Ability Tests (SCAT), level 3B, yields an IQ score. The question arises again, for purposes of measuring pupil progress, are "percentile

band" scores of the junior high achievement test truly comparable to "grade level" scores of the elementary school, especially since one elementary score results from a metropolitan test, and the other from a Stanford test? Honors pupils have now in their record IQ scores from three different kinds of ability tests (California, Otis, SCAT); which is the one used for placement, which is the most reliable one, the least reliable?

Ninth-grade basic pupils are also given an achievement test and ability test. The achievement test gives a "grade level" score but last year it was from the Stanford series, not a continuation of the Metropolitan series taken in the sixth grade. The ability test is again the TOGA, six to nine, form A.

SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

At the senior high school level, the regular track of junior high school splits. The upper part continues under the name of "regular," and its program and requirements are aimed at college. The lower part is called general, and its offerings include courses for a variety of goals.

Placement in honors requires an IQ of 130 or above "although this requirement may be relaxed if the student meets the other requirements." The other requirements are a history of good study habits, emotional and physical stability, achievement test scores above grade level in English and math, interest in being in the honors track, and approval of parents and principal. If a pupil has not been in honors throughout the junior high school grades, even if he gains honors track in senior high school, he will not be able to graduate in honors track. Credits for honors track graduation begin accumulating as far back as eighth grade (foreign language, algebra), and only pupils having all 18 in honors track from that grade are eligible to graduate as honors.

Thus, there are probably few pupils moving into honors at this level who have not been there before; but there probably are some who were in junior high honors who do not continue in that track in senior high school. Figures are not available on this point.

For placement in the regular (college preparatory) track, the IQ must be "generally, high normal or above," and achievement must be "at least at grade level, particularly in English and math." Parents and principal are supposed to approve the placement.

For placement in basic in senior high school, the criteria are now hazy since Dr. Hansen's recent ruling concerning which pupils should be placed in basic classes. Previously, for any pupil functioning 3 years or more below grade level, assignment to basic track in senior high school was required. "The track provides remedial work for students with normal potential and basic training for students with limited educational potential," Assistant Superintendent John Koontz stated.

Under the Superintendent's new policy restricting basic track to pupils with an IQ under 75, are senior high school pupils with normal potential needing remedial work now placed in general track? What was the proportion in the past of senior high basic track pupils with normal potential? Were the nearly 2,000 who have graduated from high school during the past 8 years all normal remedial pupils, or did

some of the educable mentally retarded make it all the way? From what senior high schools have basics graduated?

Placement in the general track follows no descriptive criteria. All pupils who are not eligible for honors, regular, or basic tracks are automatically general track pupils. (The important sorting in this track is for homogeneous groups for each section of each course, a kind of tracking within the track by subject.)

At present, achievement tests and ability tests are given only in 11th grade during the senior high years. In late April to early May, the top tracks all take the "Sequential Tests of Educational Progress (STEP), level 2A and 2B," the same type they took in ninth grade. The ability test is the same type (SCAT) as that taken in ninth grade. The basic pupils again take a Stanford test, this time the Advanced Partial Battery, form W, revised, and again the TOGA ability test, this one for grades 9 to 12. (Last spring, 428 11th-grade basic pupils took the tests.)

Cross tracking, or taking courses in a track outside that to which a pupil is assigned, is possible in senior high school, according to official policy. The only requirement for doing so is that the pupil must be "qualified" and have the approval of the principal. What part, if any, that IQ and achievement scores are supposed to have in judgments about whether a pupil is "qualified" for cross tracking is not clear. Until 1963-64, teachers, counselors, and principals had available not only midyear 9th grade achievement (Stanford) test and ability (California) scores, but October, 10th grade achievement (Iowa) scores, October, 11th grade ability (SCAT) scores, and October, 12th grade achievement (Iowa) scores. Now, presumably, with fewer standardized tests in senior high school, cross tracking is based more on teacher-counselor-principal judgment.

Since the track system began, changes from one brand of test to another, use of one brand of test at one level and a different one with an entirely different scoring system at another level, plus changes in testing schedule, has caused a certain blurring of the facts as to the progress of a class, or the academic standing of a class now, relative to a class that experienced fewer years, or no years, of tracking. It would be troublesome, to say the least, to try to make an accurate, defensible comparison between the graduating class this year, for example, and the track system's first graduating class in 1957. Dr. Hansen, apparently recognizing this, last spring ordered special testing by the same tests and in the same grades used 10 years ago for a 10-year comparison.

Senior class 1965, tracks 1, 2, and 3 pupils now have in their record "grade level" scores from elementary metropolitan tests, "grade level" scores from 8th grade Stanford tests, "percentile" scores from 9th grade Iowa tests, and "percentile band" scores from the 11th grade Sequential tests. [Basic pupils now seniors have "grade level" scores all the way, from Stanford tests.] Has such a variety been a help or a hindrance to an overloaded counselor trying to make a placement judgment, or a cross-tracking judgment? Does such a variety make for more, or less, accuracy in placement judgment? Is the "percentile band" score, which gives two numbers "between which the pupil's 'true' score will probably lie" usable in a track system whose criteria are expressed in terms of "grade level"?

These questions are even more pertinent when considered in the light of a recommendation from the staff of New York's "Higher Horizons" program for culturally depressed children: "Testing to measure growth in subject areas should utilize not only the same test but the same form of the test when the elapsed period is a year or more."

Achievement scores of District of Columbia schoolchildren, to have much meaning and significance to the community, would need to be presented in much more detail than they are. Citywide medians by grades tell very little of the story the community needs to know for understanding the nature, location, size of problems, and what needs to be done in terms of more money, more staff, more materials, more special programs.

Test scores grade by grade would mean more if they were given for groups of similar schools. It would be possible then to see whether the gap between poverty area pupils and other areas was closing, widening, or staying the same. Scores would mean more if given in terms of how many children were deficient in reading and arithmetic. A description of the condition of the children producing such scores and the condition of their facilities, would be helpful to community understanding. At least sample groups of class scores could be given to show gains or losses over previous years. Trends could be pointed out. Important factors, such as the proportion of newcomers, their performance compared to longtime pupils would help explain some of the pressures against the year's scores, and the effectiveness of the District of Columbia program.

Such detailed figures and studies would help to clear away many suspicions, now apparent on various sides. School test score statistics when offered, are so general, or blurred, or offered on such noncomparable bases that they serve only to puzzle, not enlighten.

THE IQ TEST

Much criticism has been leveled at the self-administered verbal IQ test as an accurate measure of ability for ability grouping. To be self-administered, a test must be read and responded to in verbal terms within a time limit. Pupils who do not read well score poorly on them. Experience in many school systems has also shown that as a "low ability" pupil moves into higher grades, his verbal IQ score is apt to decline; his deficiencies are accumulative.

Various educational experiments in the past decade, all trying to find ways to raise the "horizons" of culture-bound pupils, have agreed that innate ability cannot be assumed to be absent when it fails to show up on a verbal IQ test. It is more accurate, they say, to measure with nonverbal tests. The 1960 report of the "Higher Horizons" program in New York remarked:

The SRA nonverbal test of intelligence * * * seems to have definite value in this (culturally depressed) community. (Added to the verbal test) it rounds out the picture of a student's potentialities. Where it is high and the verbal score is low, there is likely to be latent ability * * *. A program which provides encouragement, enrichment, and motivation can reverse the trend toward a declining IQ score as the pupil moves into higher grades.

A recent program, and one closely related to District of Columbia pupils, also indicates that "ability" in culturally depressed pupils is present but not measurable by the Otis IQ test used in Washington

schools. At the Lorton Youth Center for Delinquent Boys, where 90 percent of the boys are District of Columbia school dropouts, nonverbal Beta tests produced a range of 71 to 118 IQ in a group of boys who had scored 50 to 110 on the Otis verbal test. It is striking that the bottom pupil's score rose over 20 points in the nonverbal test.

Special reading programs with this group (and with another delinquent group in another program at National Training Center) demonstrated that they were quite capable of learning, given methods more appropriate for overcoming their problems. The report on the Lorton program stated:

Since ability to achieve more than the average expectancy has been demonstrated (by this group) it seems that factors other than lack of intelligence are responsible for their underachievement in the public schools.

Dr. Hansen recently said that, "More refined techniques are being used (in Washington) to determine whether children are mentally retarded or have average ability but perform at the level of mentally retarded because of background and other factors." If these refined techniques include nonverbal tests for all poverty area pupils, they may provide a more realistic measure of ability upon which to base grouping, teaching methods, and program content. It should be remembered, however, that nonverbal tests require much more teacher time than "self-administered" verbal tests.

It is interesting that in the school for pregnant girls in Washington, a psychological test measuring "ego development" is used. The question arises as to whether such a test for culturally and emotionally deprived children might not also be a diagnostic help. The Lorton study remarks, for example, that "learning depends on the cooperation of a 'reasonable (amount of) ego'."

POLICY ON ASSIGNMENT OF TEACHERS

The specific group of children a teacher is given to teach is determined in two stages: The first at the assistant superintendent's level; the second at the school principal's level.

For elementary schools, the only stated policy about teacher assignment is that no more than 70 percent of a school's teaching staff may be temporary (teachers who do not, for a variety of reasons, fulfill the exact paper qualifications for a permanent position). There is no policy on limits of the proportion of inexperienced (new probationary-leading-to-permanent, or new temporary) to experienced (long time temporaries, and permanent) teachers. There is no policy (although there often is strong verbal suggestion) requiring teachers of honors or teachers of basics, or teachers of low achieving (normal remedials) groups to acquire special training for these specialized jobs, if they don't already have it.

In the Board of Education rules, there is no license for elementary teachers for the educable mentally retarded, thus no official description of what their training should include as a minimum. In a revision of licensing descriptions recently completed by the new head of the personnel department, and yet to be considered for adoption by the Board of Education, such a license is included; it calls for the standard education for elementary teaching in the District of Colum-

bia, except for the inclusion or addition of 6 semester hours (about two courses) in the special area.

Dr. Dorothy Johnson, Assistant Superintendent in Charge of Elementary Schools, says appointments of teachers to specific schools are made according to vacancies. She personally interviews all the persons applying for temporary appointments, a job filling most of her summer and part of her school year and requiring her to talk to hundreds of applicants. Paperwork for hiring many of these applicants is handled by her office. Apparently no one else—assistants, supervisors, or personnel officials and boards—can be trusted to do this personnel selection.

"The Personnel Department is currently recommending that Personnel handle opening interviews, the Assistant Superintendent's office a second interview, and Personnel Department handle final evaluation and hiring details."

There is no stated policy on racial distribution among school staffs. There is no stated policy on the right of a teacher to appeal her assignment if, for example, she does not want to work in a "tough" neighborhood with lower class children, or if she finds it a great hardship to travel from her home on one side of town to a school on the other. There are indications, however, that in practice such appeals are made. No data is available, of course, on how many teachers refused their assignment by withdrawing from the school system. In general, Dr. Johnson said in a recent interview that many white girls come to teach in the "tough neighborhoods," that money may be an incentive for more teachers to be willing to teach there, that perhaps a Teacher Corps (like the Peace Corps, of specially trained and prepared people) would be the answer.

Assignment of a new teacher, as a matter of practice, not stated policy, can be to a particular school when the principal of that school has recruited her for a specific vacancy there.

Policy on all the same points for secondary schools is also not stated. There is, and has been since about 1961, in the Board of Education rules a license for junior high basic education teachers. The description differs from standard description of junior high teachers only in its requiring one course in remedial reading and one course in remedial arithmetic. Few teachers, it would appear, have been licensed under this provision. In the revised licensing proposal the description will be 6 semester hours (about two courses) in "the special area."

Practice in interviewing applicants for secondary school differs little from that at elementary school, in that hundreds of applicants and hiring details are handled directly by the Assistant Superintendent's office. Usually, applicants are also interviewed by supervisors of the subject areas.

Once a teacher arrives at the school to which she has been assigned, the principal assigns her to a specific grade, and a specific section of that grade if there is more than one. In large elementary schools there may be as many as four or five general track sections of a fourth grade, for example, presumably organized in homogeneous groups. There also will usually be a separate honors group, and a separate basic group. While the Assistant Superintendent's office may suggest what place the teacher should be assigned to, the rules of the Board of Education say that the principal shall have authority

over pupils and all school employees in the building, and may establish and enforce regulations as are reasonable and necessary, provided they are not contrary to announced policy of the Assistant Superintendent or Superintendent.

Since there is no announced policy or written guidelines about what kind of classes inexperienced teachers or poor teachers or difficult personalities are to be (or not be) assigned to, the handling of the problem is dependent on the quality of the judgment of the principal, her ability to maintain good relations with members of her staff, to persuade, to inspire, to guide and supervise their work. In this, he or she is left fairly much alone, since the only supervision and authority she is subject to is that of the Assistant Superintendent and Superintendent. With 138 schools under 130 principals, the Assistant Superintendent of Elementary Schools and her 1 assistant (2 temporarily; the second hired by impacted area funds and assigned to about 60 schools in the impacted area program) obviously cannot provide adequate supervision of principals. The tendency has been for the Assistant Superintendent to check in detail those school principals whose practices have caused enough tension and complaint among teachers and parents of the school that it has come to the attention of the Assistant Superintendent.

Teacher assignment practices in the elementary schools varies from principal to principal, but appear to fall into three main categories:

(1) Assign the most effective academic teachers to the best academic classes. One result of this policy is that in some schools, an honors group may keep the same teacher 3 years. Another is that lower achieving academic classes may be assigned less effective teachers. Complaints have been expressed that this means the pupils with the most academic problems and the least effective teacher have little chance to improve. In a poverty area school, where many basic class or remedial teachers are needed, while some classes may get teachers with some special training, many others will get the newest, or poorest, or those out of favor with the principal.

(2) Assign a grade or a section of a grade to a good teacher one year and a less effective teacher the next.

(3) Seek volunteers for "hard" classes, persuade other teachers who have the right personalities and attitudes to take such classes, and aggressively seek specialized training for all of them.

That a number of elementary principals in recent years especially have been following the last practice and are encouraged by the administration is indicated by a comment in the February 1964 report of the Council for Exceptional Children:

More than 80 percent (of 154 responding to a questionnaire sent to 350 teachers of basic classes) said they are teaching educable mentally retarded classes by choice and desire to remain. Their reason was that they found teaching in these classes "rewarding and stimulating."

The report also says that over half of the responding teachers were temporary, and that 90 percent said they had had training for teaching basic classes.

This training, however, was evaluated as highly inadequate by the Council, indicating that despite all efforts, not enough is being done to prepare the teachers for their task. The group of teachers in this survey represents less than half those believed to be teaching basic classes in 1963-64. The Council commented that "neither a list

of teachers nor the number of basic classes seemed to be a matter of record." It should be noted that the elementary basic track has had a supervising director since about 1961.

In secondary schools, the practices of principals in assigning teachers follow the same general lines. Principals follow their own inclinations in the absence of written policy or guidelines from the top. In buildings where the principals assign the best academic teachers to the best academic classes, there are often complaints that morale of the teachers in "low general" and basic classes is poor, and that as subject specialists trained to teach a standard, average group of pupils, they often resist regearing themselves to teach elementary skills and a very simplified version of literature, mathematics, or history. In buildings where a teacher is given a class in each track, the complaint is that she is called upon to prepare four or five separate lessons each day, acting as a specialist to teach honors, regular, general, and basic groups. The secondary schools have had a director of special education only since 1963 and a salary in regular budget for it since 1964.

In connection with teacher assignment, the question should be posed: What kind of teacher has been found to be the most effective with slow learners and remedials in poverty areas? Experience in special projects to help a slum child succeed in school say that the teacher should be (1) someone who wants to do the job; (2) someone who is trained as a combination remedial teacher-social worker-counselor, and willing to make contact with the families of her pupils. Such a specialist, it is generally agreed, should be paid extra for the extra training, the extra long day, perhaps the year-round job, and the extra physical dangers she is more likely to meet; (3) someone who thinks "What am I doing wrong?" instead of "What's wrong with these kids?" if there is no progress.

The basic track has needed a corps of at least 500 such teachers since its start. A little more pay, status as a specialist, recognition of the significance of the work they elected to do, a crash training program by experts, the expectation of helpful supervision and guidance on the job might have called forth from the school personnel and the community enough to fill the need. An additional inducement might have been the expectation of having an aid like those trained recently at Roosevelt High School. Volunteering parents, organized by Mrs. Mamie Lee, were able, after 8 weeks training, to become aides to teachers with mentally retarded children. As one teacher commented, "Probably if teachers knew they could have an aide they would volunteer to go to downtown schools."

Contrary to the needs of the program, however, the administrators have been years behind in laying out programs, doing research on methods, training teachers, orienting principals, and getting additional personnel and materials.

PROGRAM

Between the time the track system was adopted in spring 1956 and began operation in fall of that year, there were only a few weeks to work out specific programs for 10th graders divided into four differing curriculums. In the next years, as the track system spread throughout all levels, curriculum plans and guides from the school leader-

ship stayed behind the sorting of pupils into tracks needing special differentiated programs. The task of adjusting the general program of the past to four distinct levels of instruction fell for the most part upon the teachers in the classroom.

A two-man curriculum department organized in 1957 grew to three (with three clerks) in 1964 with the addition of a secondary specialist. Committees to work with them to plan and produce specific programs were principals and teachers who added this duty to their workload.

For honors pupils at the secondary level, looking toward top universities and colleges, the program problem was minimized by the fact that "hard" courses, not required for graduation from honors, were the same as before but were now offered in an earlier grade. In subsequent years when pupils were prepared by 11th or 12th grade to take more advanced courses than had ever been offered, new courses in math, foreign language, and science were added to the offerings in some schools. To graduate, 18 units were required, 16½ of which were prescribed.

For regular track pupils in senior high, also preparing for college but at a normal rather than accelerated schedule, the question of program content was also minimized. One of the main advantages of the tracking plan was to inform students what program would meet the growing requirements of the colleges and to require that pupils planning to go to college take the needed courses. To graduate, 16 units were required, 10½ of which were prescribed.

The most serious problem was uniformity of course content from one school to another. In 1960, all available materials on course content were drawn together in a curriculum handbook for the first time by the District of Columbia Congress of PTA's.

The general track, as far as requirements for graduation are concerned, is comparable to the normal high school situation: 7½ units prescribed, 8½ elective.

The content of courses for general was affected first, however, by removing algebra and geometry as the required math course and offering instead a terminal course "General Mathematics." A general track pupil could elect to take algebra in the regular track, but needed permission from the principal (some of whom did not accept the "cross-tracking" principle) to do so. In addition, the lab science required for graduation was "Descriptive Biology" in which lab work was deemphasized. As for the required courses in U.S. history and U.S. Government, and the 4 years of required English they were labeled "general track," Assistant Superintendent Koontz said in 1960 that teachers had been instructed that these courses "should differ in range and depth from track to track." Textbooks, he said, may or may not differ from track to track.

The 8½ electives allow a general track to take courses available in the senior high schools that would prepare him for various kinds of office or service jobs. If he elected to and were permitted to take algebra, geometry, 2 years of foreign language, and regular lab science, he could also prepare for noncompetitive colleges, according to Assistant Superintendent Koontz. To "elect" a useful sequence of courses that would "add up to something" as the PTA handbook put it, a pupil required knowledge of what was available and made a logical sequence. The secondary school counselors, who until 1964-65 were mostly carrying heavy workloads, were the source of such information.

Sequences for secretarial, retailing, clerical, bookkeeping, and shop or home economics, were laid out in 1960 by Assistant Superintendent Koontz for the use of counselors and pupils, and published in the PTA's Curriculum Handbook (out of print since 1962).

Whether the level of training offered by the business sequences enables pupils to pass the civil service clerical test, or to qualify for jobs in private business is not stated. Other interesting questions are what kinds of jobs have general track shop and home economics majors found? How many general track pupils were allowed to "elect themselves out of a useful education," graduating without being ready for job or further training? How many general track pupils took the hybrid general-regular academic course, took the college entrance exams, and went on to higher education?

Criticism of the general track program has been that the meat of the courses has been so cut down by teachers following instructions to adapt course content in range and depth to the various tracks that general track pupils gain too little to enable them to raise achievement scores sufficient to move upward in track. Ineligibility for college follows, it is claimed.

The only statistical data available that might indicate that the general track program has been strong enough to produce higher achievement and upgrading by some pupils is a summary table of the number and percentage of pupils in the four curricula in senior high schools from 1958 through 1965-66. It shows that the proportion in regular track has gone up steadily from 29 percent in 1958-59 to 36 percent at the beginning of this school year. While the slight decline in honors would account for 1 percentage point of this gain in regular track, the other 6 percent would come for the most part from pupils shifting out of general track.

Another criticism concerns availability of business and shop courses in every school. Various shop and home economics opportunities are offered only in certain high schools that have the equipment. Were pupils who wanted or needed such training transferred there or did they have to be lucky and live in the area of the shop-equipped school? Only one regular high school, for example, offers auto mechanics, a very popular course. A further criticism concerns the marketable value of some of the shop courses. "Printing" for example, is for the most part learning to hand set type, a skill hardly usable in an era of linotypes and lithography. Newly built schools are still equipped with machines doing such out-of-date work.

The basic track program, as was evident from the start, was the one where innovations would be most needed. Dr. Hansen has said that before the track system, pupils with low IQ's and far behind other pupils in achievement, were called "aypical," kept in ungraded elementary classes, and taught little beyond childish manual arts. There were no such special classes at secondary level. The intention of the basic track, Dr. Hansen said, was to provide a program laid out in a sequential, developmental order, and to give it substance with remedial reading and arithmetic instruction, and instruction in geography, history, literature, and the world around them. His outline called for instruction in how to hold a job, manage a home, be a good citizen. He believed such a program would hold many pupils of this type in school for 12 years, but he expected that at the end of that time, they would be functioning academically at fourth or fifth or sixth grade level.

Dr. Hansen also prescribed extras for basic pupils—music, drama, talking, group playing, art.

Required academic units for graduation from basic track are 9½, 2 more than the required units for general track; all the courses for the track were labeled “Basic” (basic science, basic arithmetic, basic U.S. history, etc.) In the senior high school where the program first went into effect, and where it was some years before basic pupils arriving there had had a basic remedial program in junior high school, numerous secondary teachers oriented to teaching subject matter at an advanced level were called upon to teach about 3,000 pupils 16 to 20 years old in elementary school subjects. Later, when the track system was applied to junior high level, many subject matter teachers there were asked to teach remedial English (reading) and remedial arithmetic often, at primary level, to 3,000-4,500 pupils between 14 and 17 years old.

Exactly how long it took to give any kind of guidance (inservice, bulletins, teachers meetings) to *all* the hundreds of teachers needing training in how to teach reading and how to teach slow learners generally, is not part of the data received by this committee, but it seems evident that it was a gradual process. Remedial specialists and reading clinic staffs were small in numbers, and guidance in remedial reading for basics in secondary school was their responsibility, not that of the curriculum department. In other subjects, guides began to be assembled for junior high school in 1962 by the curriculum department, and at present there are bulletins for each subject and grade. The ninth grade occupational planning course, listed in the program as far back as 1960, became available in 1963.

That program development has been gradual and is still incomplete is also indicated by the following: (1) complaints about the basic program have increased in volume and intensity during the past 5 years, with claims that its remedial instruction is ineffective or non-existent, its content courses watered to nothing; (2) the report of the Superintendent's All-Level Committee on Basic Education (December 1963) included in its 12 recommendations for implementing the basic track program that “a planned, sequential, and developmental curriculum be provided,” implying that the program as it had gone on for 7 years had not been any of those; (3) the report of the Council for Exceptional Children (February 1964) said, “a well developed and appropriate curriculum, and curriculum guides from elementary through high school (are needed)”; (4) Dr. Hansen remarked in his report of April 1965 (“No Retreat in the Drive for Excellence”):

A special curriculum sequence for retarded underachievers should be organized to meet a critical need now being handled on the basis of improvisation.

Until recently, retarded underachievers had been assigned to the basic track for remedial instructions.

At the elementary level, about 2 years after the track system was installed, Dr. Hansen's “Amidon” curriculum was adopted by the elementary principals. Dr. Hansen's aim was to offer elementary children “more difficult work at an earlier age through more formal planning of lessons, consecutive and sequential use of textbooks * * *.” Phonetics as a major tool for learning to read, grammar, and composition and other “basic subjects” were given emphasis in the program. To make clear to teachers and principals how the program was structured from junior primary through sixth grade, detailed

"flow charts" were drawn up. The Amidon program was for the nearly 95 percent of elementary pupils in the general track. Elementary honors is the Amidon program enriched. Teachers and principals still plan the enriched program; curriculum charts and bulletins are in the process of planning and production, but are not yet available.

Sixth grade achievement scores through 1963-64 show little change since the Amidon program was adopted in 1961, as might be expected, since there would normally be some delay in visible effects at sixth grade level. The 1964-65 sixth grade scores, however, would be of children who were in third grade when the Amidon plan began, and would be more indicative. Unfortunately, the test given in 1964-65 is different from that given sixth graders in other years, and it is uncertain whether the scores are comparable. Unfortunately also, the scores are almost a full grade below those of sixth graders of previous years, and more than a full grade below the national norm. (These scores do not include basics.)

Curriculum "chart booklets" for the educable mentally retarded (another name for basic or special academic) in ungraded elementary class, became available in 1963 for reading and arithmetic. As in secondary schools, remedial materials and guidance for normal low achievers were always the responsibility of the reading and speech clinics, not the curriculum departments.

No data on how teachers handle ungraded basic classes in elementary school, or with what results, is available. Basics are not given standardized achievement tests by pupil personnel until grade six, and scores are not made available for study outside the school system.

A curriculum guide for the severally mentally retarded became available in fall 1965.

MATERIALS

The most essential materials for pupils—textbooks—had been in short supply for years, according to parents whose children were directly affected, when Dr. Hansen remarked in 1961: "I am, belatedly, discovering that this fundamental tool is still not available to each pupil in this school district." A drive for more textbook money has through the years increased the regular budget allowance per pupil. In addition, a special allotment of about \$152,000, to be divided among elementary schools, was secured when the Amidon program was adopted in 1961, and another the following year of about \$150,000.

Then parents and high school pupils brought attention to the fact that many secondary school textbooks were so outdated they didn't mention World War II or the atomic bomb or television. Through the efforts of then Senator Hubert Humphrey, considerable funds for extra purchases were secured in 1963, to be divided among all schools for textbooks.

For 1964-65, additional money totaling \$608,000 in "impacted aid" funds just allowed for the first time, was made available for textbooks at all levels. This would have provided \$4.25 for each of the 142,000 pupils in school, about the price of one book at today's inflated prices.

The textbook purchasing routine begins in March when each school is told its budget allotment for the next year, a figure based on the

previous October enrollment adjusted for expected increases or decreases in each school, multiplied by the per pupil textbook budget figure. In April, the requisition list of approved books is sent to each principal. He or she is expected to check the school's inventory of books, survey each teacher's needs for the coming year and what books she prefers for filling such needs, then to make out the order for submitting during the next 4 to 6 weeks. Elementary schools are required to spend all their allotment at that time; secondary schools may reserve some money for ordering in October.

If a school's order exceeds its budget and the need is justified, reserve emergency funds that have been held out of the total amount appropriated for textbooks may be used to supplement.

Books are ordered direct from publishers in June and July, with delivery expected by the time school opens the first week of September. Upon their delivery, the principal's office is responsible for checking them out, and seeing that each teacher receives her order.

Until 2 years ago, new schools received no budget for books to equip the school. Books from schools that pupils were transferring from were expected to send books from their inventory.

The need for textbooks, accumulated from a long past of skimpy budgets and heightened by great increases in pupil population, goes beyond the hundreds of thousands of "extra" dollars made available in the past 5 years. Accumulated needs in preintegration Negro schools in particular would need far more than a per capita share of such funds.

It has been reported that in practice, in some schools the more "aggressive" teachers get adequate and appropriate books for their pupils, indicating that that systematic and realistic surveying of teacher needs is not always carried out. It has also been reported that some principals are more aggressive in asking for additional books and replacement books and in justifying their need. In addition, some teachers have complained that distribution of books within their buildings is delayed from 2 to 4 months after the opening of school; crayons, paper, and other supplies are often as slow in arriving in their hands.

In a recent newspaper story, Ludlow Elementary School was reported as using battered 1948 textbooks as standard fare until "impact aid" money this fall provided some Ludlow pupils with their first music and science books. In grades two and three, "We had 5 old copies of this and 10 old copies of that," the principal (new to the school in fall 1964) said. The extra Federal funds also brought maps and globes and library books. "The school had no maps of Africa, or modern Asia," the news report said.

A recurring question at the Board of Education meetings and in PTA groups has been, Are there enough textbooks and funds, regular or special, for them or not? Dr. Hansen has answered that any school that does not have enough should ask for them.

A reporter looking into the basic track situation this fall remarked that materials vary enormously from class to class and from school to school. If the Superintendent would like to know, and not belatedly, what the actual classroom situation is, perhaps a report directly from the teachers as to what books and materials they have on hand compared to what they need, should be a routine matter every October. To quote the Council for Exceptional Children, "The fact that books have

not been adequately supplied (to basics) is a reflection on the effectiveness of supervision." Supervision in a school is primarily the job of the principal.

Books for basic classes present a special problem. They need to be simple, yet of interest to pupils often teenaged who, for the most part, live in Negro slums. Reading book characters who are very young, fair haired, and living in nice rambler-type houses are inappropriate. More books like the Banks Street series are needed.

POLICIES - FLEXIBILITY OF THE TRACK SYSTEM

Flexibility in elementary school should mean some change in numbers in the honors group, especially at the beginning of 5th grade just after the whole class has had its first ability and achievement tests in the last half of 4th grade. It should also mean that children in basic classes—especially in the past when basic classes apparently included some normal remedials—are moved into general track; and that in general track, pupils are moved into more, or less, demanding sections of a grade depending on their achievement.

Assistant Superintendent Dr. Johnson said in a recent interview that in general track flexibility is stressed; upgrading is based on reading level, tests given by the teacher (printed or teacher-made was not specified), child performance, and judgment by the teacher and principal. Dr. Hansen told the Board of Education in June 1964 that school principals test the basic pupils as part of the instructional program to determine whether they should be regrouped, replaced, or re-signed. Miss Lyons, former Assistant Superintendent, at the same meeting said that "many" pupils are taken out of basic classes and put in regular classes, and there were children spending half a day in basic class and half a day in regular class because they had done well. There are no studies or figures available on the point.

The criticism from the community has been that basic sorting begins too early, at kindergarten, first, and second; that original assignment is done on principal judgment and perhaps one test months later by Pupil Personnel; that no further testing by Pupil Personnel is done for basics until near the end of the 6th grade; that children placed in basic in primary years had such a poor program and cultural life at the school that they had little chance to improve enough to get out of basic. The criterion for moving out of basic into general track at elementary level is not clear. Presumably it is the same as that at junior high level, which as stated by Assistant Superintendent Koontz in 1961 is "in general, when the pupil is no more than 2 years below grade level" in achievement.

At the junior high level, the proportions in each track are noticeably different from elementary school. In the past few years in particular, there has been a substantially higher number of junior high basic pupils over elementary—as many as 2,000 over a 3-year period, figures indicate. How much is downgrading at the time of the shift from elementary school to junior high, and how much is downgrading in subsequent years would require much data not available. Why the downgrading occurred might be found if a study on criteria used by individual principals in a junior high-elementary family of schools were to be made; if a study on the proportions of remedial normal pupils and educable mentally retarded were made; if a study of

changes in IQ and achievement scores between 4th and 6th grade among general track pupils were made. It has been observed that low achievement scores get worse as time passes.

The same studies should indicate why the overall number of honors in junior high compared to the number in elementary school increase by about 600 over a 3-year period. Presumably they are upgraded from the regular track.

As for moving within the regular track from one section of a grade to another, there is no data.

The regular track, according to Dr. Hansen, is increased by basics who are upgraded during their junior high stay. In the 2 years 1961 and 1962, he said, 670 basics moved into regular track. Whether these were normal remedial pupils, downgraded at the time of the shift from elementary to junior high and who pulled up their achievement scores enough to move back to the regular track, is not stated.

Cross-tracking is not permitted in junior high schools. On the contrary, pupils are in a "block system," move as a group, attending all classes together.

At the beginning of the ninth grade, track placement has an important bearing on the track status of graduation from senior high school. Unless a regular track student moves into honors by that time, he will not have time to accumulate all 18 honors units required for graduation, and even if he does he will have to work extra hard. The same is generally true for basics, moving up into general track. To graduate from a track, a pupil must have taken all—not just a majority—of his required courses in that track. A student would need to know this in the seventh and eighth grades in order to have time to improve sufficiently to be upgraded in track.

Placement changes occurring when senior high school counselors and principals sort the arriving 10th graders is not available. The overall number of senior high honors pupils (1,075 in 1963-64) compared to junior high numbers is about 600 less. The overall number of senior high basics (1,760 in 1963-64) compared to junior high numbers is much less—about half. Whether their numbers are lower because many are upgraded to general track at the shift into senior high is not available. In his 1964 report on the track system, Dr. Hansen said 351 basics were upgraded during 2 years (1961 and 1962).

In general, the proportion of basic pupils to pupils in other senior high tracks has declined steadily from 22.6 percent in 1958-59 to 7.8 in 1965-66, while numbers in general and regular track together have risen about the same amount.

Upon entering the senior high school, there is for a majority of pupils a change in track, but it has nothing to do with flexibility. The top part of the junior high regular track continues as regular, while the remainder goes back to its old elementary track name, "general." During the 3 years of senior high school, probably some of these pupils move back up to regular, and some down to basic. Detailed figures are not available. Dr. Hansen says in his book, however, that in "typical year" 1960-61, 5 percent of the senior high enrollment moved from one track to another, and that 2.8 percent of this movement was upward.

Cross-tracking is a feature of the senior high school track, but not all principals permit it, according to Dr. Hansen. "High school administrators," he says in his book *The Four-Track Curriculum in*

Today's High Schools, "tend toward individuality in management, resist pressures from the central administrative office, and make their schools self-contained and self-governing principalities." How many and which of the District of Columbia senior high schools do not permit cross-tracking is not stated. It is also not known if refusal to allow cross-tracking prevents the general track student from following a "humanities academic sequence" or "scientific academic sequence" outlined as possible for them by Assistant Superintendent Koontz in the PTA Curriculum Handbook. Cross-tracking in these two academic sequences is required since there are no foreign language, algebra, and geometry courses offered at less than regular track level. How many general track pupils follow either of these two suggested academic sequences would make an interesting study.

Policy from the superintendent allows pupils to take courses in a track other than his own "if he is qualified, and if the principal approves." The first step would necessarily be recommendation by a counselor or teacher that the pupil's test scores, IQ, and grades qualify him to take a harder course in a specific subject. The principal's permission might or might not be in the nature of a rubber-stamp. The individual record of the pupil is supposed to be reviewed at least twice a year by counselor and or teacher, with a view toward upgrading whenever feasible. In senior high schools where counselors with little clerical aid have handled the records of several hundred pupils, including seniors applying for college, there is some question whether reviewing of every senior high pupil's record was possible. Detailed figures on how much cross-tracking takes place each year are not available.

THE BASIC TRACK

POVERTY CONNECTION

Washington, D.C. has 138 elementary schools housing 90,000 pupils. A high proportion of them arrived in the city during the past 5 years; many of the new arrivals were Negroes from the farms and small towns of the South. Most of them have settled in the inner city where housing is old and shabby, unwanted by good income families. They joined vast neighborhoods of poor families very much like themselves—sometime-workers, demi-families, both parents working, adults with grade school education, people used to low class life.

These grade schools feed into nearby junior and senior high schools where the median annual family income, according to one study (Dr. Elias Blake, Jr., Howard University) is as low as \$3,872. This means, of course, that half the families have less than \$3,872. It is almost axiomatic that the lower the income level of the high school, the larger the number of pupils working at basic track level. In the Shaw School alone, 35 percent are in the basic track.

The District of Columbia is not unique in the size of its poverty-hobbled population. Every big city has the same look. The problem has grown steadily as the Nation has become an urban society. It has been estimated that in 1950, 1 in 10 urban schoolchildren was "underprivileged"; in 1960, it was 1 in 3; in 1970, it will be 1 in 2, unless something is done to halt, contain, reverse the trend.

The poverty program is based on the assumption that something can be done about the poor, that the gap between them and the non-

poverty families can be narrowed, that the reasons for their poverty are not simply that they are hopelessly stupid and therefore will be with us always. The educational assumption of the poverty program is that poor people, including those who might appear to be slightly brain damaged (experts agree it is difficult to tell what is physical brain impairment and what is "experience damaged") are capable of being taught to read and write and function at a higher level than many have hitherto believed, and that for the sake of the whole society, they must be so trained. School is no longer a privilege to be taken or left alone, but an absolute necessity for the peaceful operation of our society. Without the training of 12 years if not 12 grades, individuals are not equipped to contribute and share. They become deadweight and a source of expensive, sometimes violent, trouble. One dropout male, or female, who becomes dependent on welfare can cost the productive citizens in cash at least \$50,000 for maintenance at poverty-level during a lifetime of 70 years. If he loses control of himself and lands in an institution, the cost is multiplied.

More and more during the past decade, evidence has accumulated that lack of physical brain power accounts for only part of the educational problems of the poor. They may be more hobbled and fenced in by the culture they live in than slow. Now the Federal Government is beginning to offer the money to pay for putting to use new proven methods, for devising still more methods, and for breaking away from the attitudes and assumptions of the past to change their lives.

The size of the problem in Washington is the sum total of the basic track and a large part of the general track pupils. One authority says 60 percent of the District of Columbia school population is culturally deprived, with serious language and reading deficiencies. The immediate pressure of the problem is 18,000 dropouts during the past 5 years and more expected in the next 5 years—young people with such educational and personality disabilities that hardly any employer can make use of them, even if he tries.

DROPOUTS

A dropout is a young person who sometime after passing his 16th birthday quits school and does not graduate. He is not a discharge who has left the District of Columbia school system for another, or to go to evening school or rehabilitation center, or who is "unlocated, unknown, has left city, or didn't pay tuition."

Who are the District of Columbia school dropouts? School statistics do not say. Dropout figures are not made track by track, or even grade by grade. An educated guess would be that they are the least successful pupils, and that these are found in the basic and "low" general tracks.

Thus the dropout is one of the main targets for any educational program to fight poverty. His condition educationally, physically, socially, psychologically is the very description of poverty.

At 16 or better, however, the distortion by poverty calls for so much undoing and redoing, and his cooperation is so uncertain, aid and hope for change may not make much impression. His real need was for a predropout attention 10 years earlier when he was small, directable, and had a smaller collection of habits or experiences from an all-poverty daily life.

After 16, the child must be dealt with as an independent adult, which he usually is in low-income families. He is no longer directly controllable by a parent, if he has one; he is "big enough to work" and "get out of the house", and the law that children must go to school does not apply to him any more.

At this point, the urban community is asking the young adult who wants money and whose family needs more money, to volunteer to spend his time sitting quietly in an often unappealing room, where what goes on is mostly very, very boring to him. It is also a place oftentimes where he feels the adult in charge of his success or failure doesn't like him, doesn't like having to stay in the same room with him and others like him. He is asked to volunteer to try to read words and write words he knows he can't, and then to be told on every report that he's no good. He knows that already. He's heard that **every day at home for years**.

Why bother to volunteer to do this school business when he doesn't have to? Why go to all the trouble of getting up, waiting in the cold or rain for a bus, sitting, listening to a dull old teacher, and knowing you're not going to get anything more today than you did yesterday? Real life on the street has a lot more payoff and is far more interesting. There a man can be somebody if he acts tough. There he can be competent when the premium is on ingenuity and action, not words. It's only weaklings who keep on going to school. Of course, the big trouble with being competent in real life on the streets is that there's not much money in it. If only there were a way to make street skill bring in a good income. Some say there is a way. Do a job on some well-heeled slob.

IMPORTANCE OF DROPOUT PROBLEM AND SOLUTION

Why is the battle to keep pupils in school so important?

Statistically, they are the group from which more problems and crime come than from any other.

Employers do not like to hire dropouts. In Washington, where most dropouts are Negroes, this is particularly true. If they drop out before becoming 18, when they may work without a work permit, their employment problems are increased, for it is hard to find a job for a relatively more immature, unskilled, inexperienced person.

As for crime, an indicative figure comes from Lorton Reformatory. There, 90 percent of the inmates are District of Columbia dropouts; 95 percent are Negroes. Chances of a dropout getting into trouble with the law have been estimated as being 10 times higher than for a high school graduate. For one thing, he is on the streets for several years, unemployed, while the graduate is employed in the school routine.

Probably, too, the dropouts marry earlier and have more children, thus increasing, as well as perpetuating, the problem for another generation of citizens.

Almost certainly, the biggest proportion of dropouts in the District of Columbia are from the basic track and lower section of the general track. The work to reach the dropouts, then, falls upon the shoulders of the teachers and administrators, principals who sort pupils into these groups, who plan a program that is, hopefully, relevant to their problems, and who carry the program out. It is to be hoped, since

it is, clearly, absolutely essential, that these teachers will be specialists, even experts at their job—not merely teachers who, not being fit or with too little status for other “better” jobs, have this job dropped in their laps.

HOW MANY DROPOUTS NOW?

|| A summary chart from the District of Columbia schools shows that during the past 5 years 18,000 pupils left school after they became 16 years old and before they graduated. At the present rate, city street life will see the addition of about 5,000 a year between now and 1970.

|| The 1964-65 annual rate is 9 percent of the total school population grades 7 through 12, including vocational schools, calculated on the basis of the school figures.

Has the track system had any effect on the proportion of dropout-prone pupils who actually drop out?

Whether the track system alone is responsible for the change, it appears certain that a change has taken place. A larger percentage of pupils are staying in school now than were staying 10 years ago, and more are staying than were staying 5 years ago.

School system figures invite erroneous conclusions. The figures available do not give “chances of” a ninth grader or seventh grader to graduate, and in graduating totals or “holding power” percentages leave out vocational high schools. Calculations about the percentage of a ninth grade class that graduates reflects none of the factors that could make the class larger or smaller in the course of 4 years. Data is split between two charts, with the starting year and ending year different for each.

Thus some observers, looking at the available raw figures of graduates and the actual count of dropouts over the past 5 years have declared that the dropout rate is 53 percent. Even if this were true, it would have to be added that this is better than the picture in 1956 when the track system began.

In order to give a more nearly accurate figure for present chances for graduation or dropout, much effort has been made here to put the various available school statistics together. The calculation will be given in some detail, if for no other reason than to show the complexity of finding such a figure. It should be understood that the method followed is necessarily the rough estimate, since available data though indicative, are incomplete; on holdbacks there are no data and for that one factor a reasonable assumption must be made.

Official school chart “Fall Memberships in Grades 10, 11, and 12 as Related to the Corresponding Fall Membership in Grade 9 in Earlier Years” says:

If all pupils had remained in school, the 12th grade membership (of the group) would have remained the same * * * but for various reasons the 12th grade figure is (smaller).

Analysis of charts on discharges and newcomers indicate that the size of the 12th grade would not be the same, but would be larger. A rough estimate of the newcomers for class X in 9th grade in 1961-62 is 1,340, while that for discharges is 764 over 4 years. Thus the class size would increase by about 500 for a total of 7,493 potential graduates. The factor of holdbacks probably would not affect this number significantly since holdbacks are both coming in and leaving the class, the one probably canceling out the numerical effect of the other. There are no statistics on this factor, as has been noted.

At this point, dropouts over the 4 years can either be roughly calculated from the dropout count given in a school chart, or from the difference between the estimated adjusted class X number of "potentialgraduates" and the number of 1965 graduates in both regular and vocational high schools. By the first method, numerical count of dropouts in regular and vocational senior high schools given in a school system chart during the period class X was moving through three grades is 7,838. Roughly estimating, class X moving across that period when the annual rate of dropouts was rising a point or two, and when the somewhat smaller sizes of the groups ahead probably balanced off the somewhat larger sizes of the groups behind, could be expected to pick up its equal share. That would be 2,613. In addition, class X dropouts in ninth grade would probably be at least one-third of the 1961-62 count for junior high schools, or 394. Actually this is a low estimate since ninth grade probably has more dropouts than other junior high school grades because more pupils arrive at age 16 in that grade. (Dropout count is not available grade by grade. Total for dropouts when estimated this way is 3,007, and the dropout rate, using the adjusted class X class size, is **40 percent over the 4-year period**.)

Calculating dropouts by the second method will tend to check this figure for accuracy. This is particularly desirable since estimates have been a part of the calculations. By subtracting the actual regular senior high school and vocational 1965 graduates from the adjusted class X potential graduates figure, the number of dropouts is 2,768 (7,463 adjusted base minus 4,735 actual graduates). The **rate over the 4-year period is 36.4 percent**.

(The rate probably would not be altered by class X members who may graduate after an extra year or two. The number of such post-1965 pupils is probably balanced off by the number in 1965's graduating group who were held back from previous classes. The 1965 graduate figure, after all, does include graduates from the STAY program, made up of dropouts of years back.)

The conclusion is that the 9th through 12th grade dropout rate lies somewhere between 36.4 and 40 percent. Grade by grade dropout figures would help pinpoint the correct figure.

Vocational schools are included in the calculations because class X, or any class, sends a certain number of its members to them, some pupils at the end of the ninth grade and more during the next 3 years who transfer from the regular high schools.

A pupil's chance to graduate are of course lessened when considered from the seventh or eighth grade instead of the ninth grade. In seventh, few except longtime holdbacks could reasonably be expected to reach age 16. In eighth, more would be eligible of the dropout prone type in particular. These numbers would certainly increase the dropout rate from seventh through twelfth to a few points above the 36.4 percent-40 percent range for ninth through twelfth.

ATTEMPT AT COMPARISON WITH OTHER YEARS

In his book "The Four-Track Curriculum in Today's High Schools," Dr. Carl Hansen presents a chart showing what percentage of a ninth grade class made it to the beginning of regular senior high school twelfth grade. Of course this is not comparable to the calculations

in the study here based on percentage of ninth graders graduating from twelfth in both regular and vocational high schools. Ninth grade in particular must be included since so many pupils arrive at age 16 in that grade.

However it is worthwhile to consider "holding power" figures.

They show that between 1953 and 1957, the percentage of a class count in ninth grade (unadjusted for increases and decreases during the next 3 years) who would be starting 12th grade 3 years later decreased from 56.6 to 48.2. Those who left were transfers to other systems and other types of discharges, and dropouts. Then, each year from 1957 through 1963, the percentage present at the beginning of the 12th grade increased. By 1959 it was about the same as it had been in 1953, in 1963 it had gone to 64 percent, nearly 7½ points beyond 1953, nearly 16 points beyond 1957.

These figures pertain to the school system as a whole. The additional comparison of Negro pupils who stayed in school from ninth to the beginning of 12th is more striking, especially in view of the fact that the proportion of Negro pupils increased from 60 percent in 1953 to 85 percent in 1963. Dr. Hansen's chart shows that in 1953 less than half the ninth grade count of Negroes stayed through the 11th grade. By 1956, just as the track system was starting, only 40 percent stayed. Two years later, the picture was back to the 1953 level, and in the next 5 years it improved by another 13 points to 63.3 percent, less than a point below the school system as a whole.

(It must be remembered again that in all these percentage calculations, the ninth grade base figure has not been adjusted for increases or decreases over the 3-year period, and that the "missing" pupils at the beginning of the 12th grade include both discharges and dropouts.)

While these are not graduation figures, they are certainly significant. It should be noted that numerically the school population increased from 1956 through 1963; with most of the increase attributable to Negro migrants from Southern and Middle Atlantic States. Thus the numbers of people the percentages represent in the past 5 years are substantially higher than the numbers of people before then.

Dr. Hansen believes it was his four-track organization of the school program that changed a downward trend to an upward trend, and that the pupils most benefited were the underprivileged Negroes in the lower tracks.

The "holding power" figure of 66.9 percent for 1964-65 is based on the number of regular senior high school graduates relative to 10th-grade figures 3 years before, again unadjusted for plus and minus factors. At the same time, the dropout chart shows a slight fluctuation upward in numbers during the past 2 years at regular high-school level. This apparent discrepancy is not explained.

The dropout chart also shows a steady though slight annual increase at junior high school level, from 4.4 in 1961-62 to 5.9 percent in 1964-65. When considered, however, against the growing proportion and growing numbers of low-income pupils who entered the system during that period, such a small increase in dropout rate may well mean that District of Columbia schools are holding the line in relation to the increased intensity of the educational needs pressuring it.

How does the "holding power" picture in Washington compare with other cities? "Holding Power Rate of 18 Large School Systems" (Nov. 22, 1965) indicates that Washington is doing better than Chicago, Baltimore, Cincinnati, Boston, New York, and Detroit; about the same as San Francisco, Cleveland, and Buffalo; and not as well as Dallas, New Orleans, Milwaukee, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, Los Angeles, Houston, and Seattle. The latter two claim the best holding power—between 77 and almost 82 percent of 10th graders eventually graduate.

BASIC TRACK AND THE EDUCATIONALLY NEEDY

When the track system was adopted in 1956, the basic track seemed to hold out a promise for special help for the pupils at the bottom of the educational ladder. After 8 years, many observers in the community have expressed their disillusionment, and openly, loudly doubt that the promise can be fulfilled through the mechanism of a basic track. Dr. Hansen on the other hand says "more pupils are staying in school longer than ever before in the history of the city." He points out that nearly 2,000 basic track pupils have graduated in 8 years, pupils he believes would have dropped out had the basic track program not existed.

After being increasingly pressured 2 years or more, however, Dr. Hansen has recently acknowledged several shortcomings of the past workings of the basic track. First, until this fall, there was widespread confusion as to what type of pupils the basic track was limited to. On many occasions, including his April 1965 report, Dr. Hansen has said that basic classes were exclusively for mentally retarded children "and always had been." But this fall Dr. Hansen acknowledged that prior to that time, basic classes in fact included both mentally retarded pupils and normal low achievers. Actually, such practice has been the stated policy from Assistant Superintendent John Koontz from the beginning of the track system. In the PTA Curriculum Handbook (1960 and 1961), he stated, "It is required that students who are functioning 3 years or more below grade level be assigned to basic track."¹ Purposes of the track were listed as "c(1) remedial, (2) to prepare students of limited educational potential for a useful life."¹ For a while in the early track years, there was even a separation of the basic track into basic I (retarded), and basic II (low achievers), at both elementary and junior high levels.

(It might be noted here that "crash testing" of pupils assigned by principals to basic track was started as a regular part of the annual testing routine in fall 1963, Board of Education minutes for May 1964 (p. 29) disclose. It means that every September, the Department of Pupil Personnel puts aside other work and places all its attention and resources on this group, according to the former director who instituted the "crash-testing" routine.)

The question at the moment has shifted from "Who is supposed to be in basic track and who is really there?" to "Where are the pupils removed from basic to be placed, and what kind of program will there be in actuality for them?"

The second shortcoming the Superintendent has acknowledged is related to these questions. In his April 1965 report, Dr. Hansen re-

¹ PTA Curriculum Handbook, 1961.

marked, "A special curriculum sequence for retarded underachievers (formerly in basic track) should be organized to meet a critical need now being handled on the basis of improvisation." This is a fairly clear indication that a program for remedial pupils, that large group whose reasons for failure to learn have been shown by many experiments to be tied to their cultural background, is not much if any more developed now than it was 8 years ago. The need of these pupils is still critical; the program is still being improvised by the teachers.

As for the educable mentally retarded now left in the basic track, the adequacy of the program is also uncertain. Dr. Hansen has not said anything on this point. One of the recommendations of his "All-Level Committee on Basic Education" (December 1963) was that "a planned, sequential, developmental curriculum be provided." Thus far, no such program has been made available (see section on program).

Available figures comparing test scores of basics in recent years to those of earlier show substantial gains in ninth graders for 1961 and 1962, and a falling back since then. Eleventh grade scores for 1964 of essentially the same group tested in ninth grade in 1962-63 show little growth in the intervening years.

Basics, 9th grade

Stanford achievement tests, intermediate	1960-61	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65 Stanford intermediate II
Paragraph meaning-----	4.3	5.4	5.4	4.7	4.2
Word meaning-----	4.7	5.5	5.5	5.0	4.1
Arithmetic meaning-----	4.8	5.5	5.5	5.1	
Arithmetic comprehension-----	5.1	5.8	5.7	5.1	4.8
Arithmetic application-----					¹ 4.4
Arithmetic concepts-----					¹ 4.9

¹ 1964-65 only.

Grade 11.8 basic (tests in 11th given first time, 1964).

Stanford, advanced:

Paragraph meaning-----	5.4
Arithmetic comprehension-----	5.4
Arithmetic concepts-----	6.0
Arithmetic application-----	6.0

The time where "a planned, sequential, developmental curriculum" is most needed is at elementary and junior high levels. If the basic pupil ever makes it to the 10th grade, at least he has an opportunity there to take business courses that might enable him to do simple office work. These courses have been very popular with senior high school basics of the past (proportion of mentally retarded to normal remedials unknown).

The third shortcoming of the basic track acknowledged by Dr. Hansen is its use as a dumping ground for various kinds of disciplinary misfits. In his book "The Four Track Curriculum in Today's High Schools" (1964), Dr. Hansen quotes one source as saying that public schools in general have about 2 percent of "hard core disciplinary problems." Dr. Hansen then adds (p. 127), "Some local observers claim that the basic track is used as a dumping ground for problem cases, and that this causes rebellion." (Is the implication here that

basic track placement upsets a pupil so much he becomes even more of a discipline problem?) "This claim," Dr. Hansen says, "is in part justified because principals are often desperate about what to do with severe disciplinary problems." Whether in some schools such disciplinary problems have been grouped together or scattered in with the mentally retarded and the low achievers is not indicated, except by a few principals, who say they do not.

The fourth shortcoming of the basic track which Dr. Hansen has recently acknowledged is the inadequacy of the tests for children whose learning problems are more cultural than lack of ability. At the time of the news this fall concerning the "crash testing" of basics when over 800 of nearly 1,300 were removed from basic because they were judged to be low achieving average pupils instead of mentally retarded, Dr. Hansen remarked that "more refined techniques are now being used to tell the difference" between the mentally slow and the culturally hobbled. The type of testing was not described. Critics have complained for years that the usual IQ and achievement tests alone were not accurate in evaluating pupils from a poverty environment. Whether the "more refined techniques" will be used to evaluate general track pupils from the slums was not made clear by Dr. Hansen.

The fifth shortcoming of the basic track was acknowledged by Dr. Hansen in the past year when he gave the parent the right to veto a child's placement in basic track. Before then, placement in basic for pupils below 75 IQ and or deficient in achievement as much as three grade levels, was mandatory. Now written permission from parents is required.

The sixth shortcoming of the basic track was acknowledged by Dr. Hansen when he recently revoked the right of principals to place pupils in the basic track on their own judgment, without waiting for special individual psychological testing for the pupil. This removes the personal, subjective judgment of one person as the criterion for placement in basic track. Such a decision represents a major change in attitude, for as late as March 1964, Dr. Hansen was telling the Board of Education that principals, not the Department of Pupil Personnel, was responsible for the placement of such pupils. (Board minutes, March 1964.)

One shortcoming the superintendent has not yet acknowledged is the variety of interpretations elementary principals give to policy on organizing basic classes. Answers from 55 elementary principals to a questionnaire this fall sent them by Citizens for Better Education showed that 4 principals begin "tracking" in kindergarten, 9 in the first grade, 14 in second grade, 11 in third grade, 6 in fourth grade (where most parents think tracking is supposed to begin), 1 in fifth grade, 5 on "an individual basis," and 5 not at all. Since honors are specifically set to begin in fourth grade, the tracking referred to by the principals must necessarily be the sorting out of basics. Some said as much. Actually, Dr. Hansen supports principals in this early basic tracking. He told the Board of Education in March 1964 that beginning in first grade, there are children whose problems of learning are clearly so critical that they cannot function in a regular class. (Minutes, p. 7.)

Basics in elementary school, it is agreed by all, are in ungraded classes. Younger age groups are called "Primary" and older groups

are called "Intermediate." That the classes have until now contained the mentally retarded and the average low achiever is indicated by the numbers removed this fall following the "crash testing" episode. That they contained remedial pupils is even more certainly indicated by the February 1964 report by the Council for Exceptional Children:

Your study reveals that the IQ range in the elementary school (basic pupils) is 39-104 * * * (and) in the junior high schools, 45-100.

It seems significant that studies of this kind about the realities of the basic track were made not by supervisors or school system research personnel, but by a group outside the schools trying to help with problems.

Confusion about the basis for placing children in basic classes was cited nearly 2 years ago in this most revealing report by the Council for Exceptional Children, chapter 49. Among its findings and recommendations, all of which could be used as the basis for organizing diagnostic and instructional services for the educable mentally retarded now left in the basic track, are these comments:

There was no agreement (among basic teachers) as to the basis for placing children in basic classes * * *. The (teachers') responses to the question concerning the understanding of "basic class" as practiced in each school were numerous and varied. The answers indicate mass confusion as to what the program is or should be * * *. There is (also) confusion (among teachers) with respect to the way the program is viewed by faculty and administration. The findings point up inadequate or total absence of orientation.

Replies of basic track teachers to a school system questionnaire about the same time (1963-64) included a number who felt that there were pupils in the program who did not belong there. (Board minutes May 1964, p. 29.)

The whole problem is complicated by racial overtones. Most basic track pupils are Negro. Some of their elementary school principals are white, and almost alone, racially, in the building; some other principals and teachers are middle-class Negroes who have achieved success and appear to feel contempt for those who have not.

Thus, instead of fulfilling the promise of special help in meeting the sizable needs of slum pupils at the bottom of the scale, oftentimes practices in the basic track have in reality discriminated against them. Class size, supposed to be no more than 18 ranged from 7 to 26 in elementary schools, from 25 to 42 in junior high schools, according to the Council for Exceptional Children in February 1964. Textbooks were not present in a third of the classes of teachers in the Council's study. "Many purchased their own books, others used discarded books from other classes, some reported having no textbooks at all."

Discrimination has extended into the summer program. Children who are slow learners need special or remedial work more than anyone else, but summer school remedial work is specifically closed to them. In the regular course of the school year for basics, there are other discriminations for many. Not all principals believe that basic is a track where "C" is the highest mark possible, but some do. Not all principals resist cross-tracking or up-tracking, but some do. Not every school building in the low-income areas is crowded and shoddy, but most are; and not every class set up in the corner of the boiler room, or in a cloakroom, or in a hallway, is a basic class, but they often are. Basics sometimes are assigned the very teachers who do not want

to have anything to do with them, or teachers who have not the least idea what to do with them. Although efforts have been made to offer in-service training to basic teachers, such training still appears quite inadequate. On teacher training, the February 1964 report of the Council for Exceptional Children said:

About 90 percent of the teachers indicated have had training for teaching "basic classes." This training in many instances consisted of courses in remedial reading, physical education, or one course in psychology * * * (such training) does not train a person for teaching educable mentally retarded children.

At least until very recently when there appears to have been a quickening of interest, the underlying attitude of District of Columbia school leaders toward teaching slow learners has been one of defeatism, open or covert in expression. "No one knows how to teach slow learners," Dr. Hansen in his book quotes a distinguished educator, and indicates agreement. Some principals have echoed the sentiment: "There isn't too much we can do with our children. Most of them are slow learners." (Lorton Report.) Teachers of these pupils, hearing such conclusions from their leaders might naturally ask why they are expected to do a job their leaders tell them no one knows how to do. It is significant that outside experts who have been working for years on new methods have had little or no part in the training program for District of Columbia teachers of basic pupils.

The idea of giving basics music and art and speech looks good on paper, but some music teachers will not come to basics it is reported. Others who would, often have too little time and basics are last on the list. When there is money for a few libraries in elementary schools, they are placed in "good schools where pupils will appreciate them," according to the library supervisor.

This is a long way from the program described by a New York "Higher Horizons" official as the kind that slum pupils will respond to. He called that effective program one in which culturally depressed pupils were given "all the trappings and personal attention that high income groups" get at home, in the community, and in their schools.

Such treatment is not envisioned as a special institutional job—except where young people get themselves into a prison—but as an educational job. For children of the poor, therefore, whatever track they are located, or relocated in, the schools in our times must of necessity, if the community really wants to overcome poverty, fill in the physical, emotional, and experiential vacancy left by adults in their homes who have little, nothing, or the wrong things to give them.

Many studies in other large cities agree that the reasons for underachieving are poor school adjustment (school is unlike anything they are accustomed to seeing or hearing in daily life); truancy (they are daring enough to refuse to go); lack of interest or motivation (what goes on in class is boring and they never get anything right anyway); home life provides no physical conveniences, no intellectual or psychological support for booklearning; family mobility keeps them from staying long enough in one class to find out what's going on.

Each reason for underachievement requires a counteraction by the schools. Many experiments have tried various counteractions with varying degrees of success; an accumulated record of what has been done and what works best would probably save an enormous amount of trial-and-error time for Washington. The Ford Foundation, for example, has financed programs in Buffalo, Chicago, Detroit, Mil-

waukee, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh; High Horizons was carried out in New York; the Institute for Behavioral Research, the Kennedy Institute, the Council for Exceptional Children, Pittsburgh State Teachers College, and numerous others are using and devising valuable methods and experience. In addition to these sources, experts for demonstrating methods and techniques should be brought to the District of Columbia to work with teachers.

In general, the effort must be made to remove slum children from their poverty environment as big a part of the day and year as possible, at as early an age as possible. The effort must also be made to make school at least more interesting than alley or street life. Teaching machines have been found to attract such pupils, and so have lively sympathetic teachers who build up egos and know how to teach reading. As for incentive, there is evidence that the immediate payoff, tangible even if tiny, has a kind of magnetism that verbal descriptions of big future rewards never has. Reports from numerous programs say that the hardest task is to make the culturally depressed pupil "want" to do things.

How much will such a program cost? One indication comes from New York's Higher Horizons program. The cost per pupil was \$50 above normal cost the first year, and \$27 above normal cost the following years. The lower cost resulted when the program was enlarged to include more children; results, according to reports, deteriorated.

But money alone will not do the job. It takes selected and specially trained teachers for a close, intimate job; administrators who have truly reconditioned their responses, thinking habits, and policies in regard to the Negro slum child; innovators with energy and imagination, not just staff members carrying on in the traditional patterns they learned in college education courses; and community people organized to give regular, appropriate personal attention to children in need.

CONCLUSIONS

The four-track system in Washington started out on a high note of hope nearly 10 years ago. In outline its primary purposes appeared straightforward and practical: to assure a newly racially integrated school community that the need for high standards at the top level were recognized and would be maintained or even elevated, and that the needs of the bottom level were equally recognized and a specific effort would be made to fill them. The great bulk of pupils in between would continue mostly as they had before, except for deemphasis on the academic goal in favor of business and service job goals.

In application, the track system began almost suddenly with no increase in funds (probably no other program in the country for the underprivileged child has started without special funds), without a detailed program, and without research into new methods and a requirement for rapid retraining and reconditioning of teachers. It was applied to a school system itself living on the fringes of poverty—large pupil-teacher ratios, crowded buildings, not enough textbooks, massive influx yearly of poorly trained, poverty-stricken, often-hungry children. It was applied to a school staff still adjusting to working under one administration instead of two, while struggling with overloads, shortages of physical equipment, problems of morale and cultural differences.

The track system is closely geared to definite test scores, yet the testing department has had little increase in staff in 10 years; placement questions and learning diagnosis is a job for psychologists, psychiatrists, and social workers,² but such staff members came late and can be numbered on one hand. The secondary level counseling staff has just this year reached the overall norm of 1 to 400 pupils,³ and the elementary counseling staff still does not provide a counselor for almost half the elementary schools. The track system calls for definite and specific programs, and for the lowest track a whole new program; yet the curriculum department has operated with a two-man professional staff dependent on committees of teachers, principals, and subject supervisors working additional hours. Recordkeeping, research, and analysis, essential if a plan is to be closely followed, studied, and adjusted, is the same one-man statistician operation today as it was before 1956. Supervision of new programs by a specialist is essential, yet 8 years went by before the secondary school basic program was allowed a director.

While all these deficiencies come from lack of money, other deficiencies could have been relieved by administrative policy and practice. The most important is the lack of adequate supervision of the school principals upon whom the application of the track plan depended. It seems significant in regard to the basic program, for example, that out of 12 recommendations by an "all-level" school committee 2 years ago, 4 major items concerned the need for supervision, for requiring principals to put the superintendent's policies into practice, and for orienting principals in proper attitude, methods, techniques.

Providing supervision of principals is both an administrative and a budget problem of more than ordinary difficulty. It requires preliminary planning funds for altering the administrative structure, and then it requires new salaries to pay the new supervisory staff. A proposal to reorganize the school administration and provide a supervisory-administrative staff for each of several geographic areas, was made 6 or 7 years ago. Money to study and draw up a detailed plan has been requested in six budgets, and always been cut out in the District of Columbia budget office.

In the meantime, principals, perhaps checked once or twice a year briefly by the Assistant Superintendent, have followed a variety of policies on teacher assignment, on sorting out basics, on developing teachers with specialties, on supervising teachers, on asking for materials, and even on distributing materials upon their arrival in the building. Because of the lack of contact top administrators have with teachers (the line of command dictates that the teacher must not "go over the head of" the principal), practices and attitudes of the less concerned, less efficient, less energetic, or less reasonable principals come to the attention of the administration often times after they come to the attention of the parents or the newspaper reading public.

Policy on what pupils shall be placed in basic track has been confusing for some years, primarily because of the lack of decision about how normal remedials should be taken care of. Unfortunately the question came to a point of decision by the Superintendent only after

² "Higher Horizons": "A psychiatrist and social workers a day a week for 280 students met the most imperative needs."

³ "Higher Horizons": "Counselor-pupil ratio of 1-275 was sufficient but clerical assistance was necessary."

long pressure, accompanied by a deterioration of relations between him and various elements of the community. The question of remedials is still not clarified, and the comments of the Superintendent on the subject have not been consistent.

Present policy on evaluating the track system and on informing the community gives the appearance of offering figures that demonstrate strengths, and minimizing or simply not opening for discussion the details of weaknesses and needs. While there are risks in revealing shortcomings, it is necessary to open the books, describe graphically, and call for help when an operation is dependent upon the community for its financial and moral support. To do otherwise gives the appearance of protecting a specially loved but perhaps cracking mechanism. The open, factual, if painful, approach would be more likely to arouse the public to pressure vigorously the sources of funds (as it did just after integration); it would also make it unnecessary for individuals to try to put together incomplete, incomparable, or even unavailable data and draw shocking conclusions far from or near to the truth. It perhaps would also make unnecessary an evaluation from outsiders in order to satisfy the suspicions of community and congressional elements. It seems quite possible that if significant and thoughtful adjustment had been made to the basic track 2 years ago, the present threat to the whole track system might have been avoided.

The question now raised is: Is the track system the appropriate or necessary mechanism at this time for sorting pupils and making certain that they have the services and training they need?

The academic tracks at the top, goaled for colleges, by stating clear standards, and offering specific programs reflective of college qualifications and admission demands, still serve a useful purpose.

The general track pupils with academic ability should be given the "higher horizons" treatment, encouraging them to go to college by requiring them to take all regular track academic courses on trial basis during 10th grade. The general track's varied goals should be emphasized as tracks within the track, and the sequences of possible business, service, or vocational courses publicized extensively among students.

Graduation requirements that all pupils' courses from ninth grade must be in the same track or better, seems too unrewarding for pupils upgrading themselves in senior high school. Permitting graduation from a track if all but ninth grade courses met the track standard, or if a majority of required courses are in the higher tracks, should provide more incentive for hard work.

As for the basic track, now that it has been in effect split into two parts, it would be appropriate to allow it to continue to wither away, with normal remedials in general track getting special attention, and the academically retarded in special classes with no track label.

While public labels such as those for the top tracks may be welcomed with pride, or accepted as innocuous, a "lowest grade" public label is apt to do more hurting than helping.

The educable mentally retarded will now presumably be in small special classes where efforts by specialists will be concentrated on raising reading skill, overcoming retardation if it is caused by anything other than brain damage, and training these pupils in junior high school years to do jobs by which they can support themselves

as adults. Adequate job training facilities at junior high level should be provided. The normal remedials should have the advantage of general track courses plus remedial work with a specialist either during or at the end of the school day.

Money from poverty program funds or any other special funds to train poverty area children would be needed to hire teaching specialists perhaps all year round, to provide for training staff and facilities for reconditioning and retraining teachers, for facilities, machines, and materials, for staff to collect, devise, and implement new methods and better programs, for staff to provide adequate testing, counseling, and psychological services, and for many more clerks to handle paperwork.

The track system as it now exists in Washington 10 years after it began operation, gives two major messages. First, undeveloped programs without money and staff to energize and supervise them will never work well, no matter how good the intentions of the leaders are. Second, programs to try to raise those at the bottom to a better life are very expensive because so much is needed, and they require years of **missionary type effort and zeal**.

In the District of Columbia, without money, and without a faster shift in basic premises, evaluations, and methods of reaching "basic" pupils and uplifting general track pupils, disappointment was inevitable. However, after 10 years' experience, no matter how inadequate the results appear, it seems likely that the school system is at a point where funds for poverty's children—the educable mentally retarded, the remedials, the underachievers, the unconfident, and unambitious—would produce a faster than usual payoff, provided they are accompanied by realistic policy carefully administered and **adequately supervised**.

These are the steps we believe would be necessary if the track system is to be retained. The committee believes, however, that everything being equal, the track system should be dropped and some other method developed to deal with ability grouping without stigmatizing a youngster for the rest of his life.

COLLAPSE OF THE MODEL SCHOOL DIVISION

The Model School Division was the District's program of "innovation and experimentation" in an area of the city which epitomizes deprivation.

The area chosen was one with "substantial, if not total, economic disadvantage," characterized by an endemic poverty rooted in a chronic underemployment of its people.

It is a social and racial ghetto, with a high incidence of family dislocation, of delinquency, of crime and of low educational achievement.

A sense of hopelessness and despair pervade many of its young people. It is an area, like those of Rochester, Harlem, and Watts, laden with what has been called social dynamite.

The goal of the Model School Division was development of "educational programs designed to relieve immediately—and hopefully to prevent in the future—the plight of the undereducated, unemployable, frustrated youth of today's larger cities."

To achieve this goal, a "cluster" of 19 schools plus 5 preschools has been created as a separate administrative unit to develop a "sequential program" by means of "across the board experiment * * * (in) curriculum development, utilization of teachers, management of the system itself—with provision for rapid feedback of results and rapid exploitation of the new opportunities."

The hope Superintendent Hansen declared when the Division was established "is to develop effective patterns of schooling for the youth in the poverty-afflicted area."

The plans which the school system intended to develop were to be "bold enough, imaginative enough, and flexible enough to accomplish * * * (its) * * * goals."

Plans for the Division have been in gestation for nearly 10 years, beginning with a study of the educational problems of depressed urban areas as part of the great cities project in 1956. These plans culminated in detailed proposals submitted to the Board of Education in January 1964, for an educational program in the "inner city target area," ultimately approved by the Board in June 1964, with the "enthusiastic recommendation" of the Superintendent of Schools.

Because of delays in funding and for other administrative reasons, the Model School Division did not begin its operation as a system until March 1965, although various experimental programs had been undertaken at an earlier date.

The programs developed for the Model School Division fall into five general categories: (1) in-service training for teachers; (2) remedial reading; (3) curriculum revision; (4) modification of classroom organization; and (5) varying activities for cultural enrichment, vocational training, and counseling.

Since its inception, the Division has been allocated approximately \$600,000, most of which has been applied to the programs for remedial reading, in-service training and a project for a "longer school day."

Sharp criticism has been made of these programs by the chairman of the Advisory Committee for the Model School Division, Chief Judge David L. Bazelon, in a letter to the chairman of this Committee with a copy to the Task Force. The focus of the Division, Chief Judge Bazelon wrote, is "intensive academic remediation," with no attempt to alter the structure, the procedures, and the attitudes of the school system itself. The letter states:

The programs submitted to the Office of Economic Opportunity or the Office of Education do not attack the basic reasons schools are failing to reach the deprived child. If Superintendent Hansen's commitments of June 1964 are to be realized, the school system must begin to develop the kinds of proposals it has avoided developing. It must commit resources to the development of curriculum which will make all children want to learn. It must come up with programs which change the way in which the institution operates. If certain procedures are antithetical to learning, where are the plans to try more flexible scheduling, new ways of distributing supplies, and different methods for conferring status on teachers? Where are the research designs that seek alternatives to testing? Conspicuously absent are efforts to free the Model School Division from grading restrictions or testing and grouping children. Such steps cannot be lightly taken, but there are no committees or research groups of teachers and consultants even considering the question together. Where are the plans to reduce the massive clerical tasks which inhibit the best teacher's ability to teach? What proposals have been made to utilize the wealth of talented amateurs who would like to work on a part-time basis?

The committee supports Chief Judge Bazelon's indictment of the Model School Division which, on the basis of our study, has become hopelessly bogged down in its own bureaucratic red tape and to date has been, for the most part, a deplorable disappointment.

The Model School Division has an impressive program outlined on the drawing boards, but there is no evidence that the Division has either the ability or determination to implement it into meaningful action.

Some progress has been made but depressingly little.

Experiments which modify the traditional school structure are included in two schools with an "ungraded primary sequence" in place of the conventional system of grade levels. "associative team teaching" with the use of three teachers to teach different subjects is being tried in another elementary school; and team teaching is also being conducted in a junior high school.

The listing of these projects, however, serves to underscore the validity of Judge Bazelon's principal criticisms. Measured against the depth of the problem and the goals which Superintendent Hansen has set, it cannot be said that the reach of the total program of the Model School Division seems "bold, imaginative, or flexible enough" to "relieve immediately * * * (or) to prevent in the future the plight of undereducated, unemployable, and frustrated youth" in Washington's inner city.

One of the critical deficiencies is the failure of the Model School Division to bring to the principals and to the teachers in its 19 schools either a sense of urgency or an awareness of the need for new and different attitudes in dealing with children who have suffered emotionally, physically, and culturally the deprivations of poverty.

The need for such a reorientation in staff thinking was conceded by Superintendent Hansen in testimony before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations in June 1963 when he observed that one of the

areas for which teachers are least prepared is the "nature of the culturally deprived child".

On January 15, 1964, at the recommendation of the school system's committee on the inner city target, the Board of Education approved as one of "seven major goals, delineating the chief needs to be met" the goal of helping "teachers gain greater insight into the potential and needs and problems of the target area * * *."

Yet with 700 teachers and other personnel in the Model School Division, only one workshop for this purpose with 100 teachers participating has been conducted. It is no wonder that Chief Judge Bazelon could report to this committee that the atmosphere in the schools of that Division is barely different from before the program's inception.

That atmosphere tends to be authoritarian, disciplinarian, and rigid. It is one which generally rejects the child rather than accepts or encourages him.

For any child these attitudes would be barriers to effective learning. For the children of the poor, whose lives have been conditioned by failure and rejection, a school with such an atmosphere reinforces the handicaps which they bring from home.

Two of the most important factors which are said to distinguish deprived children from others are: First, that they have fewer opportunities to speak, to ask questions, and to think problems out loud; and, second, that the attitudes of adults toward them tend to be authoritarian.

The first priority in any model school program for the children of a depressed urban area plainly should cope with this problem. Yet, except for a project for "250 potentially delinquent elementary school-children" which provides for "an exchange of ideas, suggestions and reaction" between the children and college students, none of the programs is designed to encourage greater interaction between children and adults, nor to promote the expression of their ideas without restraint.

A second conspicuous failing of the Model School Division program is in its treatment of vocational education. " * * * The acquisition of salable proficiencies and skills," in the language of the school system's report, was one of the seven major goals of the inner city target area program approved in January 1964.

What has the Model School Division undertaken to achieve this goal? The answer speaks for itself: a "special course in cafeteria training for 20 Cardozo High School girls" to be conducted by one "project coordinator and one teaching assistant" at a cost of \$14,620.

If Superintendent Hansen's stated goal of "relieving immediately the plight of the undereducated, unemployable, frustrated youth" is to be achieved, then clearly the Model School Division must put into operation work-study programs of broader scope and greater coverage than the training of 20 girls to work in cafeterias.

Similarly, the Model School Division has failed to develop an adequate program for the cultural enrichment of the children in its neighborhood. The project, as conceived, was to provide a "range of experiences" from meeting personally artists, authors, and musicians; going on tours to museums, art galleries, concerts of popular and classical music, plays, and book fairs; and, to include, significantly, a "study

of the existing culture of the model school area to see what can be offered by the indigenous residents".

In place of this comprehensive program, the Model School Division's only direct activities in the field of cultural enrichment were a series of 16 concerts and a project in which university students, in addition to tutoring and staffing libraries and study halls, arranged excursions and arts and crafts work for elementary schoolchildren.

A fourth area in which the Model School Division has developed virtually no program is in its relationship with parents. The establishment of "community schools leading toward whole family upgrading" and programs for a "higher level of understanding between parents and teachers" were included among the major goals of the inner city target area in 1964.

The only program in operation at the end of 1965, however, was that of "parent training classes for the mothers of preschool children who are not enrolled in kindergarten or preschool centers".

The "community school" project has become one for the "after school use of library facilities."

Postponed for a later year is an evening center to teach "typing, English, mathematics, electricity, woodwork, foods, and clothing."

The concept of a full "educational, recreational, social, and physical" program has apparently been abandoned along with the principle of making the school a "center for activities of community agencies and groups."

While the committee holds those in the Model School Division fully responsible for the unconscionable delays which have marked this entire program since its inception, the United Planning Organization cannot escape its responsibility for these delays.

The woeful failure by the UPO in adequately funding and implementing the Model School Division is all too apparent.

It is one of the great tragedies of our time that the school board apparently has decided to admit its total failure with the Model School Division and is now reducing the entire program to only a shadow of the high hopes spelled out when it was first announced.

The Model School Division had a chance to make the most spectacular contribution toward halting the tide of poverty among low-income youngsters. It has failed miserably.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Criteria for selecting projects for Model School Division should be formulated related to the fundamental goal of developing an educational program to relieve the plight of undereducated, unemployable and frustrated youth.
2. Priorities should be established for various programs and that a differentiation be made between immediate and long-term objectives.
3. An orientation program should be dealing with the sociological and psychological aspects of poverty, as they affect the behavior patterns and attitudes of children, be conducted for all teachers in the Model School Division
4. A project conducted by the Model School Division to provide for a nonauthoritarian atmosphere, with complete opportunity for children to develop the ability to verbalize their ideas freely.

5. The expansion of work-study and other vocational programs.
6. The expansion of cultural enrichment programs to adhere to the original proposals of the Model School Division.
7. The development of a program for fuller participation of parents in school activities and the establishment of community schools which will serve as centers for neighborhood life.
8. A wholesale replacement of those in the Model School Division; those in the United Planning Organization and those in the Office of Economic Opportunity who are responsible for the inexcusable failure in getting the Model School Division started effectively in its laudable mission.

AUXILIARY PERSONNEL

Every school needs personnel, in addition to teachers, to deal with the individual needs and problems of children, so that they may derive the maximum benefit from their educational experience. The auxiliary personnel, functioning as a coordinated team, should include counselors, psychologists, social workers, and attendance officers.

Counselors are regarded by virtually all school administrators as a necessary complement to teachers in assisting the testing, guidance, and placement of pupils.

At the end of 1965, there were 197 counselors employed in the District school system, 83 assigned to elementary schools, 65 to junior high schools, 42 to senior high schools, and 7 to other special schools.

In 1966, additional counselors are to be employed at all levels of the school system, but even with the increased number, the ratio of counselors to pupils is still far below of that recommended by authorities.

The ratios suggested for elementary schools are 1 counselor for every 350 to 450 pupils. The Board of Education has accepted a ratio of 1 counselor to 750 pupils.

But only 20 of the 137 elementary schools in Washington meet even that ratio.

Forty-one schools, as of the end of 1965, had no counselors.

Twenty-five had more than 1,000 children to be served by one counselor, many of them in neighborhoods where families are beset with the multiple problems of unemployment, poverty, and disintegration.

With such an acute need for counselors, it would be expected that the school authorities would pursue every means of obtaining qualified personnel to fill every available position in the elementary schools.

But, this is not the case.

Although the qualifications for the selection of counselors were modified by the Board of Education in September 1965, to permit employment of otherwise qualified personnel who have had no teaching experience, school officials continued to rely upon the previous more restrictive requirements.

The result has been to draw counselors almost exclusively from the ranks of teachers.

This policy has had the double effect of slowing recruitment of critically needed counselors and of depleting the number of available teachers at a time when teacher recruitment has been most difficult. With a more flexible recruitment program, the existing vacancies in the positions for counselors might well have been filled.

A further aspect of the preference which the school system has demonstrated for employment of teachers as counselors is that few of them have had specific preparation required to deal with the individual and his family or the social and emotional problems of children from poverty-afflicted families.

Requirements for counseling do not prescribe any mandatory courses or experience in dealing with such problems, nor has the

school system conducted any orientation programs for its counselors to provide such training.

The inadequacy of counseling services in junior and senior high schools is tragic.

Counselors in many of these schools lack orientation and training to give occupational or other guidance for potential dropouts and for those students who need assistance in job placement. Nor have the counselors been sufficiently informed to give meaningful help to the college-bound student, either to assist in the choice of a college or to help obtain necessary financial assistance for further education.

Inservice training for new counselors borders on the primitive; it consists of only six evening meetings at which information is given the counselor on resources in the school system and community.

Social workers are to act as liaison between pupils and their families and community agencies outside the school system to deal with the many complex problems which children bring with them into the classroom. Despite the enormous need, Washington's schools have only 7 social workers for a school population of 180,000 in the District of Columbia.

In addition, there are 9 psychiatric social workers, 32 school psychologists and 2 psychiatrists who provide diagnostic and some therapeutic services for children with emotional and behavior problems.

But this is far from enough.

One out of every ten school age children in the District is emotionally disturbed, according to the Director of the District of Columbia Health Department. Yet, only a fraction of those students in need are referred by the schools to child guidance clinics which continue to be miserably overcrowded. Only 7,282 children—or roughly half of those in need—were referred for psychological study last year by the schools' pupil appraisal services and 1,200 of these were diagnosed as having severe emotional problems.

Furthermore, psychological testing by itself does not always reveal emotional disturbance. Many teachers do not bother to refer children unless they disrupt classroom routine.

Quiet, withdrawn, disturbed children are too often not touched by psychological services.

For the 1966-67 budget, the school system requested an additional staff of 71 for the pupil appraisal service to provide 4 full teams of psychiatrists, psychologist and social workers, with each team servicing 36,000 pupils. The District of Columbia Commissioners reduced the request to 22 new positions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Intensive orientation and training courses for guidance counselors at all levels of the public schools to help them deal with special problems of disadvantaged children.

2. Recruitment of counselors from among all qualified personnel regardless of prior teaching experience.

3. Intensive training of guidance counselors in the secondary schools to provide vocational guidance, job counseling, and other support for potential dropouts and other students seeking employment.

4. Workshops for college counselors to familiarize them with opportunities for college placement and financial assistance for college students.

5. Employment of nonprofessional personnel to perform all clerical duties now handled by counselors.

6. Expansion of the use of psychiatrists, psychiatric social workers, and caseworkers.

EXTENDING THE SCHOOL DAY AND YEAR

School systems in cities throughout the country increasingly are recognizing the waste which is inherent in using the school plant only 6 hours a day, 5 days a week, 36 weeks a year.

LONGER SCHOOL DAY

An extension of the school day for enrichment or remedial work, depending on the children's needs, would especially benefit disadvantaged children whose families do not have the economic resources or well-functioning homes to provide their children with wholesome leisure time activities. "Neighborhood schools" such as exist in underprivileged areas in New York City may be desirable for some parts of Washington to help fight juvenile delinquency, give cultural enrichment and remedial help to schoolchildren, and care for younger children whose mothers must work. These schools should provide parent education classes, remedial and literacy instruction, consumer education, home making courses for mothers, as well as arts and other cultural offerings. Each "neighborhood school" should have a social worker and a community coordinator to provide a link between home and school and liaison with other community agencies.

Although the District school system has accepted the principle of expanding programs to meet the needs of disadvantaged children, the commitment has not been translated into any far-reaching programs. The school day for most children remains a 6-hour, 9 to 3 day. The schools, with a few exceptions, close their doors in the afternoon.

SUMMER PROGRAM

The use of the summer months has been generally accepted for further schooling for enrichment as well as for remedial courses, for recreational activities as well as for courses for children with special talents. Until the availability of special funds in 1964 and especially 1965, the school system did not, however, take a dynamic approach to the opportunities of summer school programs.

Although the school population increased from 78,000 to 123,000 between 1930 and 1960, summer school enrollment remained constant at 8,000.

By 1965, with a further increase in public school enrollment to 145,000, only 2,000 more children participated in the regular summer school program than in 1930. Children in the basic track could not enroll because their IQ's did not meet the regular program's minimum requirements. With the influx of special Federal funds, such as those in the Model School Division and Project Head Start, a program conducted with school personnel but by the United Planning Organization, 10,000 additional children over and above the comparable number in the regular summer schools were able to participate in some kind of special summer project during 1965.

ADULT EDUCATION

Regular evening classes for adults have shown as little expansion as the regular summer programs for children. The average membership per session in the regular adult education classes has remained constant for the past 5 years at around 6,200, although an additional 2,500 adults took part in various special courses in 1964-65.

The school system must be more aggressive in publicizing its adult offerings. It must evaluate the program to determine if classes and activities being offered are the kind which adults want and at convenient locations.

In Washington where the median educational attainment is less than a high school diploma and where many adults have not gone beyond the eighth grade, the number of individuals enrolled in the regular adult education program is too low. An effective program can enrich the whole community and its families; children whose parents are well educated are better pupils than those from culturally impoverished families.

APPENDIX

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS,
Washington, D.C., January 10, 1966.

Hon. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PUCINSKI: I appreciate your invitation to submit a model budget. Your requests indicate that the purpose of inquiry into the District of Columbia public schools is to be constructive.

My report is analyzed under the following main headings:

1. Administration.
2. School services.
3. Improvement of instruction.
4. Special programs.
5. Food services.
6. Operation and maintenance.
7. Higher education.
8. Capital outlay.
9. Application of plans.

The estimates for each element must be understood to be tentative and subject to considerable change as programs are phased in and special facilities are identified.

1. Administration

The proposed increases in funding for administration are based on today's organization.

The school board plans a study of administrative organization to determine what changes should be made in alignment of staff persons and assignment of duties.

It is proposed to use a part of title V money from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to conduct a study of the design for administrative reorganization.

When this is accomplished, it is inevitable that the costs of administration will differ from the current estimates.

2. School services

The superintendent's staff has prepared staffing schedules for model school units at the elementary, junior high, and senior high school levels. The model unit for the elementary school and the junior high school is a school of 1,000, and for the senior high school a school of 1,500. The description of staff, services, and supplies has been developed for each unit for each level.

The salient features of the model elementary unit are as follows:

An increase for staffing in counseling, social work, subject fields, shop and home economics, and speech and reading;

Supplying supportive services to teachers as clerks, assistants, and aids;

Staffing for community services to enable each school to serve as a community center with a director of community services to coordinate and initiate neighborhood activities with full use of school buildings;

Reduction in class size in grades 1 to 6 from a current ratio of 30 to 1 to a maximum of 25; in the special academic curriculum to a maximum of 15; and in the social adjustment classes to a maximum of 8;

Establishment of a preschool program with a special staff;

Funds for equipment not now usually supplied, such as typewriters, or fully supplied such as record players, television sets, film projectors;

Increases in funds for textbooks, supplies, and library books, and allocations of funds for cultural experiences, out-of-school learning activities for pupils, and field trips for members of the staff.

The chief improvements for the secondary schools are as follows:

Pupil-teacher ratios reduced from 25 to 1 to a maximum of 25 in the academic classes, with a special provision that in English the number shall be no more than 20 per class.

Ratios in other services will be set at 200 pupils to 1 counselor; 500 pupils to 1 librarian; a full-time speech correctionist for junior and senior high schools, and one full-time social worker for senior high schools.

In addition teacher aids and other paraprofessionals will be set up at the rate of 1 such employee for each 50 pupils.

Allowances for textbooks, library books, and supplies will be doubled, with a special fund for consumable paperback books and workbooks.

Funds are requested for pupil travel, admissions to cultural events, and welfare. A travel allowance for professionals is included, as well as a fund for experiment and research.

A greatly increased schedule of equipment and teaching aids is also proposed.

For occupational, vocational, and technical education plans have only recently been developed for the Board of Education by Odell MacConnell Associates, a nationally known research group organized as the Stanford Professional Center.

An exceptionally comprehensive program contemplates a plant development estimated to cost \$32 million including equipment.

3. Improvement of instruction

The staff for the improvement of instruction needs to be completely reorganized to include a special department under a deputy superintendent with an assistant superintendent in charge of the improvement of instruction and another in charge of curriculum.

Within the department of instruction to be included are subject field directors, K-12 supervisors, K-12 supervisors for early childhood education, preschool, kindergarten, and primary, a director of in-service training with adequate staff; a director of special education with adequate staff. The department of instruction will include a curriculum section under the direction of an assistant superintendent. The curriculum staff will include directors responsible for curriculum development, the preparation of publications, the operation of professional libraries, and the selection of teaching materials.

In addition a fund allocation is required to make it possible to relieve teachers of regular teaching assignments in order to develop curriculum materials and participate in in-service training activities.

Within the curriculum department should be an expanded audiovisual instruction section and a department of school library services.

Improvement of teaching should include development of greater efficiency in the use of known techniques and the continuous experimental search for new ways of teaching.

The proposed model budget does not presuppose, for example, an unchanging commitment to ability grouping. In fact, with additional personnel the need for ability grouping may be diminished, greater flexibility can be developed, and a wide variety of gifts and special abilities may be identified and developed.

A comprehensive teaching improvement effort must take into account every promising way of accomplishing the full development of each pupil's potential.

4. Special programs

The special education program should provide for improvement of existing services and the addition of new services.

The model school system will include the development of facilities for the boys' junior-senior high school now operating in a wing of a junior high school.

A special school for the girls who need special therapeutic educational opportunity should also be developed.

A new school for the education of girls pregnant out of wedlock with appropriately designed services and facilities should be constructed.

The Americanization school should be relocated in one of the buildings vacated when the five vocational schools are consolidated.

There should be a residential treatment center for the children who are mentally ill.

Cottage schools for children who need to be removed from their environment, at least, temporarily, should be developed experimentally.

A year-round camp school should be set up to enable city children to have rural experiences as part of their education.

An additional school for the severely mentally retarded children one of which now has been approved by Congress, will be needed.

A study now in process should be rapidly completed as the background for the establishment of sheltered workshops for mentally and physically handicapped youth and adults who are unable to assume completely independent work responsibilities. At this point, money for planning a program of this kind is needed, and community-wide support for the project must be generated.

5. *Food services*

The model school plan will provide free lunches to all children who want them in all public schools either through the establishment of kitchens and cafeterias within each school unit, or by the delivery of meals to the schools from central kitchens.

The estimated annual cost of a maximum school lunch service is something over \$16 million.

The justifications for the free lunch program are (1) a lunch program should be an educational experience; (2) it should assume adequate nutrition as a prerequisite for learning; and (3) it should eliminate the differentiation of those in need and those not in need, and at the same time make the lunch service available for many pupils who because they are sensitive do not now apply for free lunches.

The regular milk program will be continued but would be reduced to one package of milk per day for all children. Breakfast will be supplied where needed.

In order to supply the facilities needed for the expanded services, even the latest elementary and secondary schools must be modified. The old and inadequate schools will require either replacement or extensive modification to provide the space for the services planned in the model program.

6. *Operation and maintenance*

The increased use and expansion of school facilities will require extensive supportive custodial and maintenance staff. Not only must the staff of the custodial departments be increased but the cycle of painting must be reduced to not less than 5 years. Roof repairs, yard maintenance, landscaping, and playground equipment replacement and modification must be stepped up materially.

7. *Higher education*

This budget proposes estimates of the cost of a new junior college and a municipal college, the latter of which would offer the master's degree. The expectation is that an adequate school program in the Nation's Capital must provide facilities for at least 2,500 students in the junior college and 2,500 in the 4-year program and the graduate school.

8. *Capital outlay*

In addition to the expansion and modification needed to modernize school facilities already in existence, an extensive new construction program is also required. New facilities are needed for expanding enrollments. The teachers college will require two major facilities. The consolidated occupational, vocational, and technical school, a facility of primary importance, is costly because the offerings are unusually expensive. In addition, the school system needs a new administration center, the cost of which can be partly deferred by the sale of public school plants now occupied by the administrative offices.

9. *Application of plans*

The application of plans must proceed with predetermined order as funds are received to carry them out.

A major guideline is to enhance the programs first in the impact aid and title I (ESEA) schools. The purpose should be to increase the proportion of educational services in ratio to the economic-cultural need.

A word of caution is imperative: Unless within a reasonable time all schools, regardless of deprivation, are given maximum support, parents who can afford private schools will abandon the public schools. Schools that do not win maximum use by the community fail to get total support from the community.

The current effort to concentrate school resources in the economically deprived neighborhoods must be maintained, but it must be balanced by a total effort to supply superior school services in every section of the city.

10. Summary

Two questions will be raised concerning proposals being submitted here: (1) Why have not the school superintendent and the Board of Education moved in direction of achieving the objectives defined in the model budget proposals? And (2), will it be possible to fund the kind of program which is described here or is the proposal in itself fiscally irresponsible?

The school board and the administration have already taken steps, even though they may be meager ones, toward the realization of most of the programs proposed here. In fact, many projects are underway on a limited scale. Illustrations are the school for pregnant girls, the therapeutic school for boys, the school for the severely mentally retarded.

In answer to the second question, the development of the programs described here will not be accomplished without extensive capital outlay and a more than doubling of the annual per capita operating costs. Investment in education is self-replicating, because as citizens are prepared to be productive they not only contribute to the growth of the national gross product, but they stay off relief roles, and out of jail or rehabilitation centers. Moreover, to the extent to which education can offer complete services to children costly retardation and remediation will be reduced. It is far less costly to prevent educational illness than to cure it.

The Federal Government will be obligated to assume a larger proportion of the cost of the operation of the schools and supplying new construction than it now does even though great progress has been made during the past year. At least 50 percent of the cost of running the schools of the District of Columbia should be supplied by the Federal Government because the city school system is working with an impacted and generally under-educated population that comes from all parts of the country. The education of Washington's children is a national problem and, therefore, should be supported in a large part by the Federal Government.

If the legislative and executive branches of our Federal Government mean to lift public education to the level of maximum efficiency they can do no better than to make the District of Columbia public schools a demonstration of their purpose.

This set of budget estimates is submitted with the understanding that actual determination must be governed by conditions as they exist at the time of requests for funds.

I am pleased to have had this opportunity to make a report of this kind to you.
Respectfully submitted,

CARL F. HANSEN,
Superintendent of Schools.

Summary of estimates, model District of Columbia school budget, fiscal year 1967

Program:

I. Administration	Estimate cost ¹
	\$3, 155, 000
II. Instruction:	
(a) Elementary schools	101, 300, 000
(b) Junior high schools	26, 800, 000
(c) Senior high schools	19, 900, 000
(d) Vocational, adult, and summer school	6, 281, 000
(e) Pupil personnel services	3, 478, 000
(f) Supervision and instruction	2, 229, 000
(g) Special education:	
(1) Boys social adjustment school	\$205, 000
(2) Girls social adjustment school	137, 000
(3) Pregnant girls school	325, 000
(4) Itinerant instruction to aurally and visually handicapped	164, 000
(5) Schools for the severely mentally retarded	581, 000
(6) Schools for physically handicapped	708, 000
	2, 120, 000
III. Food services	162, 108, 000
IV. Operation and maintenance of plant	16, 009, 000
V. Higher education:	18, 912, 000
2-year community college	\$3, 748, 000
4-year college of arts and sciences	4, 476, 000
VI. Research, planning, and evaluation (areas for further study)	8, 224, 000
VII. Capital outlay	4, 000, 000
Estimate of total funding	212, 408, 000
	265, 747, 000
	478, 155, 000
Recapitulation of operating expense requirements:	
Total model budget estimate	212, 408, 000
Present funding by funding source:	
District of Columbia budget	\$75, 354, 000
Federal and other funds	² 15, 256, 000
Estimate of additional appropriations required to fund the model District of Columbia budget	90, 610, 000
	121, 798, 000

¹ Rounded to the nearest \$1,000.² Public Law 874—\$4,300,000; Public Law 89-10—\$6,353,000. Vocational funds—\$669,007; food services—\$1,042,000. Other: Private and Federal: \$2,892,000.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, FRANKLIN ADMINISTRATION
BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Model District of Columbia school budget, fiscal year 1967 - General administration

Departmental requests	Additional budget requests		Total fiscal year 1967 REQUESTS	
	Number of positions	Estimated fiscal year 1967 expense	Number of positions	Estimated fiscal year 1967 expense
Present administrative budget, all funds			274	\$2, 237, 807
General administration			3	22, 749
TSA-6 assistant to Deputy Superintendent	1	\$12, 135		
GS-5 clerk-stenographer	1	5, 618		
GS-4 clerk-typist	1	4, 996		
Secondary school administration			12	107, 590
TSA-5 executive assistant: (1) junior high schools, (1) senior high schools	2	25, 476		
TSA-6 directors: (2) junior high schools, (2) senior high schools	4	48, 540		
GS-6 administrative aid	2	12, 346		
GS-5 clerk-stenographers	2	11, 236		
GS-4 clerk-typists	2	9, 992		
Elementary school administration			8	64, 409
TSA-5 executive assistant	1	12, 738		
TSA-6 directors	2	24, 270		
GS-6 administrative aid	1	6, 173		
GS-5 clerk-stenographer	2	11, 236		
GS-4 clerk-typists	2	9, 992		
Pupil personnel services			9	72, 669
TSA-5 executive assistant	1	12, 738		
TSA-6 assistants for administration and special programs	2	26, 424		
GS-6 administrative aid	3	18, 519		
GS-4 clerk-typists	3	14, 988		
Personnel administration			16	140, 941
TSA-6 Deputy Chief Examiner	1	12, 135		
TSA-8 personnel recruitment officer	3	35, 289		
GS-12 Supervisor, Personnel Administration	1	11, 426		
GS-9 personnel staffing specialist	1	8, 072		
GS-6 administrative aid	3	18, 519		
GS-5 qualification rating clerk	2	11, 236		
GS-7 Supervisor, Board Writing Section	1	7, 280		
GS-4 clerk-typist	4	19, 984		
Reeruitment travel			7, 500	
Printing supplies			4, 500	
Equipment			5, 000	
Business administration			10	70, 130
Business office:				
GS-14 administrative officer	1	15, 764		
GS-6 administrative aid	1	6, 173		
Procurement Section:				
GS-11 supply management officer	1	9, 653		
GS-7 procurement assistant	2	13, 560		
GS-4 procurement clerk	2	9, 992		
GS-4 delivery control clerk	2	9, 992		
Equipment Unit: GS-4 clerk-typist	1	4, 996		

Model District of Columbia school budget, fiscal year 1967—General administration—
Continued

Departmental requests	Additional budget requests		Total fiscal year 1967 requirements	
	Number of positions	Estimated fiscal year 1967 expense	Number of positions	Estimated fiscal year 1967 expense
Buildings and Grounds			10	\$66, 440
GS-11 architect	2	\$19, 306		
GS-7 engineering	2	13, 560		
GS-5 draftsman	2	11, 236		
GS-6 administrative aid	2	12, 346		
GS-4 clerk-typist	2	9, 992		
Research, budget, and legislation			17	109, 370
Budget, planning, and statistics:				
TSA-10 planning associate	1	10, 795		
GS-11 research assistant	1	9, 653		
GS-13 systems analyst	1	13, 446		
GS-5 administrative aid	1	5, 618		
GS-5 clerk-stenographer	1	5, 618		
GS-4 clerk-typist	1	4, 996		
GS-3 clerk-office assistant	1	4, 472		
GS-4 age verification clerk	1	4, 996		
Finance Office:				
GS-7 assistant supervisor, book- keeping and payroll	2	13, 560		
CS-5 cost clerk	1	5, 618		
GS-5 accounting machine oper- ator	1	5, 618		
GS-4 payroll and leave clerk	2	9, 992		
GS-4 voucher examiner	3	14, 988		
Division of instruction and curriculum ¹			28	262, 850
TSA-2 Deputy Superintendent	1	24, 421		
TSA-5 executive assistant to the Deputy Superintendent	1	13, 695		
TSA-3 Assistant Superintendent, in- struction	1	16, 905		
TSA-6 assistant for administration	1	13, 212		
TSA-3 Assistant Superintendent, curriculum	1	16, 905		
TSA-6 assistant for administration	1	13, 212		
TSA-7 coordinator of personnel and programs	1	12, 243		
Office staff, Deputy Superintendent:				
GS-9 office manager	1	8, 072		
GS-8 administrative aid	1	7, 419		
GS-7 administrative aid	2	13, 560		
GS-5 clerk-stenographer	3	16, 854		
Office staff, Assistant Superintend- ents, curriculum and instruction:				
GS-8 administrative aid	2	14, 838		
GS-6 administrative aid	6	37, 038		
GS-4 clerk-typist	6	29, 976		
Supplies		3, 500		
Equipment		21, 000		
Total, model administrative budget			387	3, 154, 955
Total increase			113	917, 148

¹ This is a new organizational unit.

*Model District of Columbia school budget, fiscal year 1967—Elementary school
(1,000 pupils)*

Type of position or item	Distribution of 1,000 students	Ratio	Staff required	Total cost
Class 6 principal		1 per school	1	\$13,212
Class 8 assistant principal	500:1	2	23,526	
Class 15 counselor	500:1	2	15,865	
GS-4 counselor aid	500:1	2	9,992	
Class 15 school social worker	500:1	2	13,192	
GS-4 social worker aid	500:1	2	9,992	
Class 15 librarians	1 per school	1	6,596	
GS-4 librarian aid	500:1	2	9,992	
Class 15 reading teacher	1 per school	1	6,596	
Class 15 speech teacher	do	1	6,596	
Class 15 art teacher	do	1	6,596	
Class 15 mathematics teacher	do	1	6,596	
Class 15 foreign language teacher	do	2	13,192	
Class 15 science teacher	do	1	6,596	
Class 15 physical education teacher	do	1	6,596	
Class 15 music-vocal teacher	do	1	6,596	
Class 15 music-instrumental teacher	do	1	6,596	
Class 15 shop teacher	do	1	6,596	
Class 15 homemaking teacher	do	1	6,596	
GS-8 administrative aid	do	1	7,419	
GS-6 secretary	do	1	6,173	
GS-5 clerk	do	1	5,618	
GS-4 clerical aid	2 per school	2	9,992	
Class 15 kindergarten teacher	137	50:1	3	20,403
Class 15 1 to 6 grade teachers	631	25:1	25	170,025
Class 15 social adjustment teachers	70	8:1	9	61,209
Class 15 special academic teachers	29	15:1	2	13,602
GS-4 teacher aid		1 per 2 teachers	39	194,844
Class 15 preschool teachers	137	15:1	9	61,209
GS-4 school aid		15:1	5	24,980
Substitute service for meetings, etc		do	1	1,976
GS-7 nurse		1 per school	1	6,780
Class 14 coordinator of community program		do	1	7,206
Class 15 teachers of community program		6 per school	6	40,806
GS-4 recreation aid for community program		2 per school	2	9,992
Pay raise, TSA staff (10 percent)				54,475
Total personnel costs	133 ^{1/2}			878,227
Equipment				5,900
Textbooks		\$10 per child		10,000
Supplies		do		10,000
Library		\$5 per child		5,000
Cultural trip, admission assistance to deprived children				5,000
Educational trip for staff				1,000
Maintenance, repair, replacement of equipment				5,000
Administrative supplies				1,000
Subtotal				42,900
Total operating budget per elementary school				921,127

Summary: Estimated total fiscal year 1967 model elementary school budget:

- (1) Enrollment, preschool to grade 6
- (2) Number of elementary units of 1,000 pupils
- (3) Total fiscal year 1967 model elementary budget, at \$921,000 per unit (approximate)

110,000
110
\$101,300,000

Model District of Columbia school budget, fiscal year 1967

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL (1,000 STUDENTS)

Type of position	Ratio	Staff required	Total
Class 6 principal	1 per school	1	\$13, 212
Class 6 assistant principal	500:1	2	26, 424
Class 15 counselor	200:1	5	39, 660
Class 15 librarian	500:1	2	13, 192
Class 15 teacher		60	408, 060
Business		(4)	
English		(10)	
Fine arts		(4)	
General academic		(26)	
Home economics, shop		(6)	
Physical education		(6)	
Reading		(1)	
Special academic		(3)	
Class 15 teachers (part-time extra day).	For community programs.	6	40, 806
Class 14 coordinator	do	1	7, 206
Class 15 social worker	500:1	2	13, 192
Class 15 speech correctionist	1 per school	1	6, 596
GS-7 nurse	2 per school	2	13, 560
GS-8 administrative aid	1 per school	1	7, 419
GS-5 clerk-stenographer	3 per school	3	16, 854
GS-4 paraprofessional aid	1 per 2 teachers	30	164, 880
GS-2 nonprofessional aid		5	20, 560
GS-6 administrative aid, counselor	1 clerk for 3 counselors.	1	6, 673
GS-4 clerk-typist, counselor	do	1	5, 496
GS-4 librarian aid	500:1	2	10, 992
GS-4 social worker aid	500:1	2	9, 992
Pay raise, TSA staff (10 percent)			58, 193
Total, personnel costs		127	882, 985
Supplies (\$10), textbooks (\$10), library books (\$5).			25, 000
Travel, professional			1, 000
Field trip, admission and assistance to deprived children.			5, 000
Equipment (addition and replacement).			5, 000
Equipment (educational)			5, 900
Subtotal			41, 900
Total, operating budget per junior high school.			924, 885

Summary: Estimated total fiscal year 1967 model elementary school budget:

(1) Enrollment, grades 7 to 9..... 29,300
 (2) Number of junior high units..... 29
 (3) Total fiscal year 1967 model junior high school budget, at \$925,000 per unit (approximate)..... \$26,800,000

Model District of Columbia school budget, fiscal year 1967—Continued

SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL (1,500 STUDENTS)

Type of position	Ratio	Staff required	Total
Class 6 principal	1 per school	1	\$13,212
Class 8 assistant principal	500:1	3	35,280
Class 15 counselor	200:1	8	63,456
Class 15 librarian	500:1	3	19,788
Class 15 teacher, full-time		104	734,032
Business		6	
Counselors		3	
Dinner education		3	
English		15	
Fine arts		4	
General academic		58	
Home economics, shop		6	
Physical education		8	
Religion		1	
Class 15 teacher, substitute	1 per school to release staff for professional meetings.		3,600
Class 15 speech correctionist	1 per school	1	6,853
Class 15 social worker (school)	1 per 500	2	13,192
Class 15 teachers, part-time	(For community, extended day programs).	8	56,464
Class 14 coordinator	do	1	7,206
GS-7 nurse		2	13,569
GS-8 administrative aid		1	7,419
GS-6 secretary		1	6,173
GS-5 clerk-typist		12	67,416
GS-4 paraprofessional aid	1 per 2 teachers	52	285,792
GS-2 nonprofessional aid		5	20,560
GS-6 administrative aid, counselors	1 clerk for 3 counselors.	1	6,673
GS-4 clerk-typist, counselor	do	2	5,496
Pay raise, TSA staff (10 percent)			96,305
Total, personnel costs		207	1,462,486
Supplies			33,000
Textbooks			9,000
Equipment			5,000
Equipment (educational)			5,900
Cultural improvement			10,000
Travel for professional			15,000
Travel, admission, assistance to deprived children			5,000
Subtotal			69,400
Total, cost per senior high school			1,531,886

Summary: Estimated total fiscal year 1967 model senior high school budget:

- (1) Enrollment, grades 10 to 12 19,200
- (2) Number of senior high school units of 1,500 pupils 13
- (3) Total fiscal year 1967 model senior high school budget, at \$1,532,000 per unit (approximate) \$19,900,000

Model District of Columbia school budget, fiscal year 1967—Vocational, adult, and summer schools

Request	Unit costs		Total costs	
	Number of positions	Expense	Number of positions	Expense
1. Operation—Consolidated vocational, technical, occupational school:				
A. Day school division:				
Administration				
Class 5 director	1	\$13, 695	61	\$466, 247
Class 6 principal	1	13, 212		
Class 8 assistant principal	5	58, 815		
Class 7 director of instruction (academic subjects)	1	12, 243		
Class 7 director of instruction (shop subjects)	1	12, 243		
Class 15 cooperative training coordinator	4	27, 412		
Class 15 counselor	20	158, 640		
GS-7 nurse	2	13, 560		
Class 15 psychometrist	1	6, 853		
Class 15 social worker	10	65, 960		
GS-10 coordinator	1	8, 826		
GS-8 administrative aid	1	7, 419		
GS-6 clerk-stenographer	1	6, 173		
GS-5 clerk-stenographer	2	11, 236		
GS-4 clerk-typist	10	49, 960		
Instruction			520	3, 411, 070
Class 15 academic teacher	190	1, 341, 020		
Class 15 shop teacher	150	1, 020, 150		
Class 15 librarian	10	70, 580		
GS-4 teacher aid	170	849, 320		
Textbooks (\$15 per student)		75, 000		
Supplies (\$10 per student)		50, 000		
Cultural improvement		5, 000		
Subtotal, day school division			581	3, 877, 317
B. Evening school division:				
Administration				
Class 6 principal	1	13, 212	13	117, 686
Class 8 assistant principal (male)	1	11, 763		
Class 8 assistant principal (female)	1	11, 763		
Class 7 director of instruction (academic subjects)	1	12, 243		
Class 7 director of instruction (shop subjects)	1	12, 243		
Class 15 cooperative training coordinator	1	6, 853		
Class 15 counselor	3	23, 796		
GS-7 nurse	1	6, 780		
GS-8 administrative aid	1	7, 419		
GS-5 clerk-stenographer	1	5, 618		
GS-4 clerk-typist	1	4, 996		
Supplies		1, 000		
Instruction			265	472, 886
Class 15 academic teacher	100	191, 728		
Class 15 shop teacher	120	229, 709		
Class 15 librarian	1	6, 853		

Model District of Columbia school budget, fiscal year 1967—Vocational, adult, and summer schools—Continued

Request	Unit costs		Total costs	
	Number of positions	Expense	Number of positions	Expense
1. Operation—Consolidated vocational, etc.—Continued				
B. Evening school division—Con.				
GS-4 teacher aid	44	\$39, 596		
Supplies (\$1 per student)		5, 000		
Subtotal, evening school division			278	\$590, 572
Pay raise, TSA (10 percent)				332, 099
Subtotal, consolidated vocational, technical, occupational school			859	4, 799, 988
2. General adult education and summer school programs:				
A. Fiscal year 1967 base budget			(807)	871, 035
B. Adult education (additional staff)			29	165, 868
Class 8 assistant principal, Americazation	1	11, 763		
Class 15 teacher, Armstrong	7	47, 607		
Class 15 teacher, Americazation	2	14, 116		
GS-4 clerk-typist	3	14, 988		
GS-3 clerk	1	4, 472		
GS-2 clerk	9	6, 148		
Program extension (to permit 112 night operation)		10, 000		
Class 7 supervising director for:				
Curriculum and research	1	12, 243		
Student personnel services	1	12, 243		
Instruction and teacher training	1	12, 243		
Class 15 psychometrist	1	6, 853		
Class 15 social worker	2	13, 192		
C. Summer schools (additional staff)			(1, 504)	1, 135, 476
Class 6 principal	(51)	53, 550		
Class 15 teacher	(1,019)	667, 445		
Class 15 counselor	(133)	87, 115		
GS-5 clerk-typist	(67)	44, 220		
GS-4 clerk	(67)	38, 190		
GS-4 aid	(167)	95, 190		
Supplies and books		149, 776		
Pay raise, TSA (10 percent)				179, 741
Subtotal, general adult education and summer school programs			29	1, 481, 085
Total, vocational, adult, and summer schools			(2, 311)	
			888	6, 281, 073
			(2, 311)	

¹ Summer and part-time personnel.

Model District of Columbia school budget, fiscal year 1967—Pupil personnel services

Request	Office request		Total	
	Number of positions	Estimated cost	Number of positions	Estimated cost
Attendance office				
Class 12 director	1	\$9, 600	108	\$678, 370
Class 10 assistant director for general administration	1	10, 795		
Class 12 chief attendance officer	5	48, 000		
Class 15 supervisor, census nonresident	1	6, 801		
Class 15 school attendance officer	55	362, 780		
GS-3 clerk-typist	5	22, 360		
GS-4 clerk-typist	19	94, 924		
GS-4 claim clerk	10	49, 960		
GS-5 clerk-stenographer	8	44, 944		
GS-6 administrative clerk	2	11, 236		
GS-8 office manager	1	7, 419		
Office equipment		5, 600		
Supplies		1, 000		
Travel allowance		2, 960		
Guidance office			8	65, 234
Class 7 supervising director	1	12, 243		
Class 10 assistant director	3	32, 385		
GS-5 clerk-stenographer	1	5, 618		
GS-4 clerk-typist	3	14, 988		
Social work division			8	65, 234
Class 7 supervising director	1	12, 243		
Class 10 assistant director	3	32, 385		
GS-5 clerk-stenographer	1	5, 618		
GS-4 clerk-typist	3	14, 988		
Group measurement			31	215, 524
Class 7 supervising director	1	12, 243		
Class 10 assistant director	1	10, 795		
Class 15 educational psychologist	25	171, 325		
GS-6 administrative clerk	1	6, 173		
GS-4 statistical draftsman	1	4, 996		
GS-4 statistical clerk-typist	2	9, 992		
Child Study Division (based on a team for each 18,000 students and 161,200 preschool to teachers college or 9 teams):				
Class 6 team director (1 per team)	9	110, 565		
GS-14 psychiatrist (9,000:1)	18	283, 752		
Class 15 psychologist (2,000:1)	81	777, 600		
Class 15 psychiatric social worker (6,000:1)	27	238, 140		
GS-9 administrative aid (1 per team)	9	73, 998		
GS-6 administrative aid (3 per team)	27	180, 171		
GS-5 clerk-stenographer (3 per team)	27	165, 186		
GS-4 clerk-typist (3 per team)	27	134, 892		
Subtotal, personal services	225	1, 964, 304		
Supplies		18, 000		
Equipment		27, 000		
Rental space		189, 000		
Subtotal		234, 000		
Total, child study division			225	2, 198, 304

Model District of Columbia school budget, fiscal year 1967 - Pupil personnel services—Continued

Request	Office request		Total	
	Number of positions	Estimated cost	Number of positions	Estimated cost
Special education placement			5	\$40,162
Class 6 director	1	\$13,212		
Class 10 assistant director	1	10,795		
GS-6 administrative clerk	1	6,173		
GS-4 clerk-typist	2	9,992		
Salary increase, TSA Staff (10 percent)				215,566
Total estimated model pupil personnel services budget, fiscal year 1967			225	3,478,394

Model District of Columbia school budget, fiscal year 1967 - Division of Instruction and Curriculum

Request	Number of positions	Estimated cost
DEPARTMENT OF INSTRUCTION		
Class 6 director, K-12	60	\$211,392
(Art, business and distributive education, English, foreign language, history, home economics, industrial art, mathematics, military science, music, science, health, physical education, athletics, and safety, trades and industrial education, reading clinic and services, speech clinic and services, adult education.)		
Class 7 supervising director, K-12	21	257,103
Class 10 Supervisor, K-12	60	647,700
(Art, business and distributive education, English, foreign language, history, home economics, industrial arts, mathematics, military science, music, science, health, physical education, athletics, and safety, trades and industrial arts, reading clinic and services, speech clinic and services, adult education.)		
Class 10 supervisor, early childhood education	32	345,440
(Preschool, kindergarten and primary-JP grade 3).		
Class 6 director, inservice training	1	13,212
Class 7 supervising director	1	12,243
Class 10 supervisor	3	32,385
Class 6 director, special education	1	13,212
Class 7 supervising director	2	24,486
Class 10 supervisor	4	43,180
Total		1,600,353

Model District of Columbia school budget, fiscal year 1967—Division of Instruction and Curriculum—Continued

Items requested	Number of positions	Estimated cost
DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM		
Class 6 curriculum director----- (Early childhood education, elementary, secondary, adult education, special education.)	5	\$66, 060
Class 7 supervising director----- (Curriculum research and development.)	16	195, 888
Class 7 supervising director, publication division-----	1	12, 243
Class 10 supervisors----- (Graphic arts, manuscript editor, production research.)	4	43, 130
Class 10 supervisor, professional curriculum laboratory-----	1	10, 795
Class 15 librarian-----	1	6, 596
Class 15 curriculum writers-----	32	211, 072
Class 6 director, audiovisual-----	1	13, 212
Class 7 supervising director, audiovisual-----	1	12, 243
Class 10 supervisor, audiovisual-----	1	10, 795
Class 15 librarians, audiovisual-----	2	13, 192
Class 15 teachers, audiovisual-----	2	13, 192
GS-7 graphic artists, audiovisual-----	2	13, 560
GS-6 administrative aid, audiovisual-----	1	6, 173
Total-----		628, 201
Total estimated cost-----		2, 228, 554

Model District of Columbia school budget, fiscal year 1967—Boys' social adjustment school

Type of position	Ratio	Staff required	Total
Class 6 principal	1 per school	1	\$13, 212
Class 15 counselor	do	1	7, 932
Class 15 psychologist	do	1	6, 853
Class 15 social worker	75:1	2	13, 192
Class 15 teacher, full-time	10:1	15	105, 870
GS 7 nurse	1 per school	1	6, 780
GS 6 administrative aid	do	1	6, 173
GS 4 paraprofessional aid	do	2	9, 992
GS-2 nonprofessional aid	do	1	4, 112
Total, salaries plus benefits		25	174, 116
Books and supplies			1, 800
Travel, admission, assistance to deprived children			1, 000
Travel, professional			200
Equipment (addition and replacement)			7, 000
Educational equipment (audiovisual)			5, 900
Pay raise			14, 706
Total		25	204, 722

Model District of Columbia school budget, fiscal year 1967—Girls' Social Adjustment School (100 students)

Type of position	Ratios	Staff requested	Total cost
Principal	1 per building	1	\$13, 212
Counselor	do	1	7, 932
Psychologist	do	1	6, 853
Social worker	do	1	6, 596
Teachers, full time	10:1	10	70, 580
Secretary, GS-6	1 per building	1	6, 173
Paraprofessional aid, GS-4	do	1	4, 996
Pay raise, TSA	do		10, 517
Total, salaries, benefits, etc.		16	126, 859
Equipment			3, 600
Supplies			300
Travel for professional staff			100
Expendable funds for students (travel, admissions, welfare).			500
Audiovisual equipment			5, 900
Total, operating budget			137, 259

Model District of Columbia school budget, fiscal year 1967—Pregnant Girls School

Type of position	Ratio ¹	Staff required	Total cost
Class 6 principal	1 per school	1	\$13, 212
Class 15 psychologist	do	1	6, 853
Class 15 counselor-librarian	do	1	7, 932
Class 15 social worker	100:1	4	26, 384
Class 15 teacher, full-time	25:1	16	112, 928
GS-5 administrative aid	1 per school	1	6, 173
GS-5 clerk-typist	do	1	5, 618
GS-7 nurse	do	1	6, 780
GS-5 paraprofessional aid		5	24, 980
Pay raise, TSA staff (10 percent)			23, 671
Subtotal, personnel costs		36	303, 931
Books and supplies			2, 800
Travel allowance for professionals			1, 000
Travel, admission, assistance the deprived			1, 800
Equipment (addition and replacement)			10, 000
Educational equipment (audiovisual)			5, 900
Subtotal			21, 500
Estimated total, fiscal year 1967 budget		36	325, 431

¹ Assumes 400 pupils in average daily membership.

Model District of Columbia school budget, fiscal year 1967—Itinerant services to aurally and visually handicapped secondary school students

Type of position	Ratio	Staff required	Total cost
Teacher, sight conservation	8:1	6	\$40, 806
Teacher, braille	8:1	2	13, 602
Teacher, hearing conservation	8:1	2	13, 602
Total, salaries plus benefits		10	68, 010
Pay raise			6, 801
Travel			2, 500
Supplies			1, 200
Equipment			2, 000
Estimated total, fiscal year 1967 budget		10	81, 511

Model District of Columbia school budget, fiscal year 1967

SCHOOL FOR SEVERELY MENTALLY RETARDED

Type of position	Staff required	Total cost
Class 6 principal	1	\$13,212
Class 8 assistant principal	1	11,763
Class 15 teacher	43	292,443
Class 15 counselor	2	15,864
GS-7 nurse	1	6,780
GS-6 administrative aid	1	6,173
GS-4 clerk-typist	1	4,996
GS-2 teacher aid	43	176,816
Pay raise, TSA staff (10 percent)		33,328
Subtotal, personnel costs	93	561,375
Educational supplies		12,900
Textbooks		4,300
General supplies and equipment		2,500
Estimated total, fiscal year 1967 budget	93	581,075

SCHOOLS FOR PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Class 6 principal	1	\$13,212
Class 8 assistant principal	1	11,763
Class 15 psychologist	1	6,853
Class 15 counselor	1	7,932
Class 15 librarian	1	6,596
Class 15 social worker	2	13,192
Class 15 teacher	60	408,060
Class 15 physical education teacher	2	13,602
GS-8 nurse	1	7,419
GS-6 nurse	2	12,346
GS-4 practical nurse	9	44,964
GS-10 chief physical therapist	1	8,826
GS-7 physical therapist	6	40,680
GS-7 occupational therapist	1	6,780
GS-4 aid	1	4,996
GS-6 administrative aid	1	6,173
GS-4 clerk-typist	1	4,996
GS-3 clerk-typist	1	4,472
Evenings school		7,692
Summer school		1,301
Pay raise (10 percent TSA)		49,020
Subtotal	93	680,875
Postage		95
Printing and reproduction		100
Other services		45
Supplies and materials		19,665
Equipment		5,140
Travel		1,820
Subtotal		26,865
Estimated total, fiscal year 1967 budget	93	707,740

Model District of Columbia school budget, fiscal year 1967—Food services

Free lunches for all students: For 161,200 students per day, 185 days per school year, 45 cents per lunch (29,882,000 lunches)	\$13,419,900
Free lunch for needy children in summer schools: ¹ For 20,000 students per day, 40 days summer program, 45 cents per lunch (800,000 lunches)	360,000
Breakfast for needy children: For 20,000 children per day, 225 days per school year, 45 cents per child per breakfast (450,000 breakfasts)	2,025,000
Free milk in elementary schools: ² For 110,100 children a day, 185 days per school year, \$0.01 per $\frac{1}{2}$ pint (20,368,500 $\frac{1}{2}$ pints)	203,368
Total estimated expense, food services	16,008,268

¹ This lunch and breakfast program would supply needy children with about $\frac{1}{3}$ of their daily food requirement for 225 days per year or about 40 percent of their annual requirements.

² A separate serving of milk will be available for each child in addition to milk in the lunch.

Model District of Columbia school budget, fiscal year 1967—Operation and maintenance

Requests	Additional budget requests		Total fiscal year 1967 requirements	
	Number of positions	Estimated fiscal year 1967 expense	Number of positions	Estimated fiscal year 1967 expense
Operation of plant, fiscal year 1967 base budget				\$8,850,975
ADDITIONAL REQUESTS				
Operations of plant			104	915,948
Field supervisors	2	\$17,632		
Clerks	2	11,236		
Custodians	100	460,080		
Supplies, fuel, utilities		427,000		
Equipment operations and maintenance			3	158,524
GS-9 equipment inspector	1	8,072		
WBR-12 window shade services	1	6,639		
WRB-9 automotive mechanic	1	6,064		
Maintenance and repair of motor vehicles		6,000		
Repair service to instructional equipment		129,749		
Warehouse operations			18	100,055
GS-9 traffic manager	1	8,072		
GS-4 clerk-typist	2	9,992		
GS-4 accounting posting machine operator	2	9,992		
GS-3 clerk	2	8,944		
WBR-9 bus driver	1	6,064		
WBR-6 truckdriver	3	16,977		
WBR-5 warehouseman (general)	2	10,966		
WRB-5 truckdriver	4	21,932		
WBR-3 laborer	1	4,616		
Overtime pay for annual inventory services		2,500		

Model District of Columbia school budget, fiscal year 1967—Operation and maintenance—Continued

Departmental requests	Additional budget requests		Total fiscal year 1967 requirements	
	Number of positions	Estimated fiscal year 1967 expense	Number of positions	Estimated fiscal year 1967 expense
Supplies				\$75,090
Custodial supplies		\$26,650		
Paper products		20,000		
Uniforms		1,440		
Office supplies (Department of Business Administration)		2,000		
Forms and letterheads		25,000		
Equipment				39,876
2 Accounting posting machines		3,500		
3 trucks		13,500		
4 trucks		12,800		
2 carryalls		4,400		
Tote boxes		1,176		
Snow removal equipment		4,500		
Estimated total, fiscal year 1967 operations of plant budget			125	10,140,468
Maintenance of plant				
Fiscal year 1967 base budget				2,508,50
Estimated annual maintenance funds to maintain plant		1,165,000		
Estimated deferred maintenance backlog		5,100,000		6,265,000
Estimated total, fiscal year 1967 maintenance budget				8,773,500
Estimated total, operations and maintenance, model District of Columbia budget, fiscal year 1967			125	18,913,968

Model District of Columbia school budget, fiscal year 1967—Higher education

PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE (2 YEARS)

I. Personnel compensation:

A. Administration, 12 months:

1. President	\$20,000
2. Dean	18,000
3. Associate dean	15,000
4. Dean of students	15,000
5. Associate dean of students	12,000
6. Fiscal officer	15,000
7. Bursar	12,000
8. Director of admissions	15,000
9. Registrar	12,000
10. Director of public relations and placement	12,000
11. Librarian	15,000
Total, administrative	161,000

B. Instructional, librarians, and counselors, 10 months:

1. 25 professors, at \$15,000	375,000
2. 25 associate professors, at \$14,000	350,000
3. 75 assistant professors, at \$12,000	900,000
4. 75 instructors, at \$10,000	750,000
5. Associate librarian	12,000
6. 6 assistant librarians, at \$10,000	60,000
7. 6 counselors, at \$12,000	72,000

Total 2,519,000

C. Classified personnel, 12 months (nurses, administrative aids, clerks)

250,000

D. Wage board employees, 12 months

150,000

E. Fringe benefits, at 10 percent (insurance, health benefits, retirement)

308,000

Total 3,388,000

II. Communications and utilities (electricity, gas, telephone, postage)

50,000

III. Printing and binding

15,000

IV. Consultant and other services

10,000

V. Supplies and materials (educational supplies, magazines and periodicals, fuel oil, phonograph records, and miscellaneous supplies)

100,000

VI. Equipment (Library books, office, classroom, and library equipment, typewriters, playground and gymnasium equipment, and audiovisual equipment)

100,000

VII. Travel (faculty, consultants and students)

10,000

VIII. Subsidy for cafeteria

50,000

IX. Repair and maintenance

25,000

Total operating budget 3,748,000

100 D.C. SCHOOLS AS THEY RELATE TO THE WAR ON POVERTY

Model District of Columbia school budget, fiscal year 1967—Higher education—Continued

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES (4 YEARS)

I. Salaries:

A. Administrative:

1. President	\$25,000
2. Vice president	22,000
3. Dean of college	20,250
4. Assistant dean	16,000
5. Dean, graduate school	18,000
6. Assistant dean, graduate school	16,000
7. Dean of students	17,500
8. Director, student teaching	16,000
9. Bursar	12,000
10. Director of admissions	17,500
11. Director of recording	15,000
12. Librarian	16,000
13. Assistant dean of students (males)	13,700
14. Assistant dean of students (females)	13,700
15. Assistant director of admissions	13,700
16. Assistant director of recording	13,700
17. Director of placement and public relations	12,850
18. Director of guidance and testing services (2 associate professors as assistants)	16,000 29,400

Total

324,300

B. Instructional:

1. 55 professors, at \$16,000	880,000
2. 55 associate professors, at \$14,700	808,500
3. 37 assistant professors, at \$12,700	469,900
4. 36 instructors, at \$12,000	432,000
5. 10 Librarians, at \$12,700	127,000

Total

2,717,400

C. Aids and clerical

II. Library operation (books, audiovisual materials, supplies, binding and microfilms, periodicals)	382,600
Total	132,600

III. Operation and plant maintenance:

1. Salaries for 26 staff	121,720
2. Electricity, gas, fuel oil, repairs, supplies	75,400

Total

197,120

IV. Auxiliary enterprises (lunch room program, athletic program)	130,312
Total	197,120

V. Health services:

A. Salaries:

1. Psychiatrist	16,000
2. Director, health service	8,200
3. 2 nurses	14,000
4. 1 laboratory technician	6,000

B. Medical supplies and materials

Total

49,200

VI. Public relations (assemblies, newspapers, entertainment, commencement, convocations, art gallery, special weeks and programs, recruitment, information service, radio and TV coverage)	19,200
Total	49,200

VII. Visiting and consultant services (part-time faculty, consultants)	40,000
Total	40,000

Model District of Columbia school budget, fiscal year 1967—Higher education—Continued

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES (4 YEARS)—continued

VIII. Instructional materials, supplies and equipment	\$25, 000
IX. Communications media (films, filmstrips, projection equipment, cameras, tapes, and recorders)	7, 280
X. General expense (insurance, bonding, health benefits, social security, retirement, workers compensation)	400, 000
XI. Travel (administrative, faculty, and students)	15, 000
XII. Postage, telephone, telegraph	11, 000
XIII. Printing (college catalog, graduate catalog, semester bulletins, brochures, blanks, forms, cards)	25, 000
Total operating budget	4, 476, 000
Total, higher education	8, 224, 000

*Model District of Columbia school budget, fiscal year 1967—Areas for further study**Area for study**Estimated cost*

1. A consultant study of organization, administration, and management and pupil record systems (development of the maximum feasible use of automatic data processing procedures is part of this study)	¹ (\$100, 000)
2. Curriculum study	² (125, 000)
3. Development of experimental classroom and school organizational patterns	² (20, 000)
4. Program of sheltered workshops for handicapped adults	⁽³⁾
5. Residential treatment center for severely emotionally disturbed children	⁽³⁾
6. Development of comprehensive school health services, including diagnostic and appropriate therapeutic capabilities	⁽³⁾
7. Cottage schools for homeless children	⁽³⁾
8. Specialized "subsystem" for exceptionally gifted children	⁽³⁾
9. Funds for research, planning, and evaluation	⁴ 4, 000, 000
Total	4, 000, 000

¹ Based on estimates received, the \$100,000 is for planning only. Implementation would undoubtedly increase costs. ADP costs probably would approximate \$200,000 annually.

² Negotiations are in process but estimates are still being developed.

³ These are areas of study for which the need is evident but planning has not reached a stage where even planning costs are identified.

⁴ The entire school program suffers from the lack of adequate program planning founded on solid research and evaluation developed in accordance with established research techniques. Education here and elsewhere has no "risk capital" to develop and implement new programs; e.g., programmed instruction, "machine teaching," television and other audiovisual approaches, and the areas of study referred to in this section. About 2 percent of the budget should be allocated for guidance and evaluation of the other 98 percent of the program.

Model District of Columbia school budget, fiscal year 1967—Capital outlay

Level	Capacity	Amount
A. Replacement or additional capacity:		
Elementary	11,412	\$37,212,000
Junior high	9,692	32,781,000
Senior high	6,266	20,979,000
Vocational	5,000	32,000,000
Sharpe health	104	811,000
Severely mentally retarded	400	3,042,000
Total, replacement or addition		126,825,000
B. Reduction in class size:		
Elementary		29,400,000
Secondary		8,360,000
Total, reduction in class size		37,760,000
C. Modernization:		
New facilities (art, science, etc.)		37,302,000
Permanent improvements		29,100,000
Total, modernization		66,402,000
D. Multipurpose centers (121, at \$40,000)		4,840,000
E. Special programs:		
Americanization school		2,000,000
Boys school		700,000
Girls junior-senior high		1,860,000
Total, special programs		4,560,000
F. College construction:		
College of arts and sciences		11,690,000
2-year community college		8,270,000
Total, college construction		19,960,000
G. Central administration		5,400,000
Total, capital outlay		265,747,000

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C.

To: Hon. Roman C. Pueinski.

From: Education and Public Welfare Division.

Subject: Summary of reports of grouping practices from selected urban school districts 500,000 and over in population.

As we have discussed over the telephone last week (December 6), we have prepared several charts to summarize the results of the survey we made, at your request, of the grouping practices reported by a number of urban school districts 500,000 and over in population. These charts, tables I, II, and III, are attached.

Table I summarizes the reports made by these selected urban school districts of their grouping practices in their elementary schools; table II summarizes reports of their grouping practices in their secondary schools; and table III summarizes reports of their evaluation as to how effective these grouping practices have been in terms of benefiting culturally disadvantaged pupils.

In preparing these charts, we would like to point out that they are only summaries of the *answers reported* by the school system to questions we asked on our survey questionnaire to them. (These returned questionnaires have already been sent to you.) As far as possible, we have tried in the summary charts, table I and II, to report the answers made by the school systems in their own language. Where the school system attached explanatory materials rather than answering the questionnaire as such, we attempted to summarize the needed data from the materials. In table III, we have directly quoted the answers made by the school systems as to the effectiveness of their grouping plans for the education of culturally disadvantaged pupils.

As the data on the charts indicate, almost all the school systems report some system of grouping in both their elementary and secondary schools. There appears, however, to be a wide variety of grouping plans and policies. Often, it seems, the grouping practices in many school districts may be generally left up to the individual school principal (or, in the case of a self-contained elementary school classroom, up to the individual teacher). City-wide grouping policies seem often to be flexibly interpreted from school to school.

The criteria by which grouping is made also appears to vary, but the criteria that are quite frequently reported are (1) the results of test scores (particularly achievement in reading and mathematics and ability), and (2) the judgment of teachers and the principal.

Most school systems report that their reevaluation of a pupil's placement in a particular group is continual and that there is flexibility in the ability of an individual to move from one group to another as the need arises. Many of the school systems seem to indicate that although they believe their present grouping practices and policies are satisfactory, any grouping system has its limitations or drawbacks, and there is an attempt to find yet better grouping methods.

Should you have any questions regarding the data on the chart, may we suggest that you might wish to refer to the original answers from the school districts.

MARTHA GROSSE.

TABLE 1. Summary of reports of grouping practices from selected urban school districts (in, mun) and over in population, elementary school (K-6) 1/2

School district	Ability grouping for first grade begins	Criteria for ability grouping	Frequency of reevaluation of pupil placement other than by ability	Effectiveness of grouping
Los Angeles, Calif. 2	1st.	Total scores, IQ, and standardized group and individual tests. Achievement (standardized and teacher-made tests). Teacher judgment of physical, social, and emotional maturity. Background of experience in reading.	Continual	Works well in terms of pupils' needs and a good instructional presentation.
San Francisco, Calif. 3	1st.	Yes. Ability grouping within the self-contained classroom, principally in the subject areas of reading and arithmetic, but also, when needed, in other subject areas such as spelling and handwriting, and so on. Also, ability grouping in classroom made up of 2 half-grades.	Test scores: Reading, oral and written. Teacher judgment.	Successful in that it has reduced the span of ability with which the normal classroom teacher must work and has given the teacher materials for working with different ability level pupils.
San Diego, Calif. 4	[Presumably 1st.]	Yes. Ability grouping within the self-contained classroom [apparently] when needed, particularly in beginning reading. Also special classes for physically handicapped, mentally retarded, and special programs for the gifted pupil.	"Teacher judgment of 'known' ability and reading level used in dividing class into working groups within the self-contained classroom."	

Dade County, Fla. (Miami).	Yes. A variety of grouping practices used, the most common being for reading and arithmetic with the self-contained classroom. Also have cross-groupings within a grade level, and some across-grade grouping in reading and arithmetic, in some schools.	Kindergarten.	Individual inventory made up of test scores: Reading and arithmetic (tests developed on a local level). Teacher judgment.	Continual (whenever the teacher thinks it is necessary).	Also use self-contained classroom with team teaching and multi-age grouping as a basis for class assignment with adjacent grouping for instruction.	Are working toward an individualized program of instruction. This seems to be a good direction.
State of Hawaii.	Yes. There is no master plan, but almost all schools do group; strong feeling of school autonomy appears to allow each school to group according to its own plan.	Kindergarten.	Varies, but usually at 1st. (Follows age grouping in kindergarten.)	Varies, but heavy reliance on—Test scores: Particularly reading. Teacher judgment.	Once a year in most schools. More often in nongraded schools.	(School autonomy would make this a matter for each school to decide.)
New Orleans, La.	Yes. Pupils grouped according to their needs, interests, ability, and maturity. In the 1st grade are usually 3 reading groups in developmental reading, and 2 in mathematics.	Kindergarten.		Grouped according to pupils' needs, interests, ability and maturity. Pupils are grouped in a kindergarten readiness program depending on their needs, abilities, maturity, etc.	Continual. Pupil's placement re-evaluated as often as needed, groupings are flexible throughout the year.	Reasonably well. How well the system works depends largely on the skill and industry of the individual teacher.
Baltimore, Md.	Yes. Grouping is according to the best judgment of the principals and teachers involved and takes into consideration the effect of the personalities of the teacher and child on one another. Classes are composed of pupils representing a variety of abilities, talents, interests, and needs. Extremes in the range of ability and achievement are avoided.	Kindergarten.		Test scores: Primary Mental Abilities (grade 1); Khulman-Anderson (grade 2); achievement tests (later grades). All data in cumulative folder. Principal judgment. Teacher judgment.	Continual. Child may be transferred within school or between schools as occasion demands.	Very well.

TABLE 1.—Summary of reports of grouping practices from selected urban school districts 500,000 and over in population, elementary school

(K-6); Continued

School district	Ability grouping practices	Grade, heights	Criteria for ability grouping	Frequency of revaluation of pupils, percentage	Grouping practices other than by ability	Effectiveness of grouping practices
Detroit, Mich.	Yes. A variety of grouping practices are used, with the attempt to allow each school to group according to its needs. In schools where there are several classes on a grade there may be considerable amount of grouping by ability. There are also special classes for the physically and mentally handicapped, and special ability and remedial classes both in school and out of school for many types of learning.	All grades.	Test results, Teacher judgment. Programmatical and that of supervising school personnel (counselors, and so on) [presumably when needed]	10% [plans to be flexible, but at least once a year at promotion time]		Reasonably well. This system is maintained, and "works" at least as well, has a sound no "system," that does not have its disadvantages.
St. Louis, Mo.	Yes. Ability grouping within an integrated primary unit 3-8, program for gifted.	K-3. Integrated primary unit 3-8, program for gifted.	Continual. In integrated primary unit, reading readiness test, reading readiness test scores, principal's written judgments. Programmes for gifted. Test scores, IQ, reading, language, arithmetic, parent-teacher conference, parent's consent.	Continual. In integrated primary unit, reading readiness test, reading readiness test scores, principal's written judgments. Programmes for gifted. Test scores, IQ, reading, language, arithmetic, parent-teacher conference, parent's consent.	Regular classes (grades 4-8) are organized on an achievement basis using standardized test scores in reading skills, and work study skills, and mastery of English composition skills, together with considerations of chronological age and learning ability.	Best system for their particular set of problems. Continually re-evaluating programs and practices in order to do a better job.
Buffalo, NY		Varies.	When ability is a grouping criterion. Test scores, general IQ.	No systemwide policy has been established specifically for ability grouping. Individual school principals do attempt to organize into teachable class-outlines, which are sometimes heterogeneous and other times homogeneous in one or more characteristics including ability.	Not completely satisfied. But with no conclusive research evidence to indicate otherwise, it would be economically wise and educationally sound for us to institute a firm policy for grouping by ability or any other single criterion, at least at the elementary level.

New York, N.Y.	<p>Yes. Homogeneous grouping of pupils at both ends of the spectrum—intellectually gifted and slow learners.</p> <p>Other than grouping pupils of both ends of the spectrum by: Achievement in reading and arithmetic skills; teacher judgment.</p>	<p>At least once a year, as needed during the year.</p> <p>The classification of our schools is determined in large measure by the pupil-teacher ratio that currently prevails through experimental projects and demonstrations such as the more effective schools program, ungraded primary, higher horizons, and other programs to improve ethnic balances, we are exploring possibilities for improved grouping practices. The pupil-teacher ratio in these programs and projects is more favorable than that in regular schools.</p>	<p>Very well. Pupils are working in small groups with their peers in reading, but are associating with their age peers in other classroom activities.</p>
Cleveland, Ohio		<p>Yes. The ability ranges for the grouping are as follows: Major work 125 IQ and up; enrichment 110-124 IQ or PLR; X groups 105-124 IQ or PLR; Y groups 85-104 IQ or PLR; Z groups 84-70 IQ or PLR; slow learners 70-50 IQ or PLR.</p> <p>All regular classes have pupils divided in 3 groups, X, Y, Z. The pupils in each group read books suited to their ability levels. In all other subject areas the class works as a whole unit.</p>	<p>Continual. Achievement in daily work and scores on Cleveland reading tests and standardized tests are used.</p> <p>Test scores: IQ (individual Binet or group tests). Achievement in reading and arithmetic. Teacher judgment.</p>

See footnotes at end of table, p. 110.

TABLE 1.—Summary of reports of grouping practices from selected urban school districts (7th, 10th, and over in population, elementary school (K-6)^{1,2}—Continued

School district	Ability grouping practices	Criteria for ability grouping	Frequency of reclassification of pupils	Grouping practices other than by ability	Effectiveness of grouping practices
Cincinnati, Ohio----	Yes to a degree along with other factors. Ability is one factor used in the classification of pupils. It is a modified ability grouping of children. In large basic schools with 8 or 9 1st grades there may be heterogeneous grouping of the top third, the middle third, and the bottom third. In small schools there may be cluster groupings with 6 or 9 children who are outstanding given to 1 teacher with the range in the class going down at low as low average. This is done so that the smaller group of able children may form a group within the class.	1st - Kindergarten usually grouped by age.)	At least once a year (but varies with pupils' needs.)		Very satisfactorily. Better than strictly grouping by IQ or achievement.
Philadelphia, Pa----	Yes to a degree along with other factors it appears within the classroom. In most cases children are grouped in such a way as to reduce the range of reading levels within classes.	Chronological age Test scores. Reading and other.	Physical and emotional maturity.	Are not satisfied with procedures and feel that continually study and experimentation needs to be done.
				Teacher's judgment.	Heterogeneously, e.g., by alphabet or chronological bases or by maturity.

Pittsburgh, Pa.-----	Kindergarten and 1st.	Chronological age. Test scores: I.Q. and reading. Teacher's judgment.	In some schools which do not use formal ability grouping, classes are organized on a random or alphabetical arrangement of pupils.	Generally satisfactory. Feel that the freedom allowed principals has resulted in general satisfaction with pupil grouping.
			Each principal is free to use grouping by alphabet or similar type of system.	Ability grouping in the disadvantaged sections of the city has assisted children in achieving and therefore, has kept them in school. There are advantages in special education classes. High interest among students, fewer failures and decrease in the number of dropouts have been the results in the schools using the non-graded primary and modified Joplin plans.
Houston, Tex.-----	No, only for certain subject areas such as reading.	2d grade, (1st grade pupils grouped according to chronological age.)	Teacher's judgment (most important). Test scores: Reading and achievement. Mental maturity scores (used as one factor only and then only in upper grades).	Continual. Adjustments are made from one class to another, but most readjustments are made within the classroom groups.
San Antonio, Tex.-----	Yes. Pupils are grouped according to ability into classes of slow, average, and bright in 30 of the 73 elementary schools. In 20 of these schools, children have from mild to severe language handicaps, where ability grouping is used pupils are still grouped within the classroom into flexible reading and mathematics groups, and in other subject areas where class needs in dictate. There are special classes for the deaf, blind, mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, and physically involved. There is a separate school for the physically handicapped. Now being organized are multilevel remedial classes in the disadvantaged areas under title I of the Federal Education Act of 1965.			

TABLE 1.—Summary of grouping practices from selected urban school districts (K-6)¹ and over in population, elementary school² (Continued)

School district	Ability grouping practices	Grade begins	Criteria for ability groups ³	Frequency of reclassification of pupils and placement in other classes	Effectiveness of grouping practices
Seattle, Wash.	Yes, at least to some degree in some schools. Variety of organization in different schools. [See column on "Grouping practices other than by ability".] Most schools are organized in homogeneous self-contained classrooms with an achievement emphasis to facilitate instruction in various subject areas.	Third, sometimes in the lower grades.	Test scores. Test scores, achievement, aptitude, interests, etc.	Some schools use achievement for reclassification. Most schools use aptitude, achievement, team teaching, available pupil assignment; cluster grouping; grouping by age; language arts block, academic placement.	Good. It allows each student to organize his own needs. However, are not satisfied with status quo and are looking for better ways to organize.
Milwaukee, Wis. . .	Basically, ability grouping is not used in organizing classes at the elementary level. However, ability grouping is implemented in the special program for children and youth of superior ability in the ungraded primary unit (grades 1-3). It is possible to have ability grouping in the organization of classes. Also, there is grouping in grades 4-6 in the various subject areas (reading, arithmetic, spelling, etc.). Special grouping is provided for the several sorts of classes in special education; e.g., grouping of mentally retarded children, children with learning disabilities, emotionally disturbed children, etc.	For the gifted, the first grade. For the average, the second grade. For the slow, the third grade.	In addition to the general program for the gifted, there is a special program for the average, and a special program for the slow.	All classes at the elementary school level are basically grouped. With the exception of the gifted, all classes in this school are at the same level. It is possible to provide for the gifted in all regular school classes for the average, and for the slow in all regular school classes.	Program for gifted works well in meeting the needs of the gifted. With the average, grouping in various subject areas helps to provide for individualized instruction in all regular school classes.

¹ (K-6)—Kindergarten through 6th grade, the normal elementary school grades.² This chart summarizes the answers reported by selected urban school districts 500,000 and over in population regarding grouping practices in their elementary schools.³ Joplin plan—achievement grouping in reading within a grade or within intermediate grades.

TABLE II.—Summary of reports of grouping practices from selected urban school districts 500,000 and over in population: Secondary school (7-12)^{1,2}

School district	Grouping practices	Flexibility of grouping	Criteria for grouping	Frequency of reevaluation of pupil placement	Effectiveness of grouping practices
Los Angeles, Calif.	Varying practices are used in the 125 schools in the district. In general, grouping is provided for above average, average, and below average classifications with special provisions in all schools for the academically gifted and the educationally retarded.	Within the limitations of program scheduling, students are grouped on a subject basis. The flexibility of grouping procedures usually permits recognition of each student's academic strengths and weaknesses.	(The 3 standard criteria which would be considered in all schools would include): Reading ability or level. Scholastic aptitude. School achievement record of pupil.	Continual. However, scholastic achievement marks are received quarterly and individual consideration of proper placement is determined at least once each semester.	The present grouping practices are satisfactorily meeting the needs of school communities. However, each school continually evaluates its grouping procedures in an attempt to improve this aspect of the education program.
San Francisco, Calif.	Grades 7-9 (junior high school): Ability grouping in academic subjects is used. Specific practices vary from school to school in order to serve the different needs of the particular student population in each school. In some instances, homerooms are heterogeneous and subject classes are homogeneous, in others both are grouped. Some schools group separately for different academic subjects and others do not. The delineation between groups may be sharply defined or the division made into 3 broad classifications. The attempt is to do whatever is best in the particular situation to provide the best instructional situation for each student.	Enough flexibility is permitted so that full adjustment can be made to the needs of individual students.	Grades 7-9 (junior high school);	Pupil placement is reviewed each semester.	The grouping systems used at the respective secondary levels work satisfactorily at those levels. Enough flexibility is permitted so that full adjustment can be made to the needs of individual students.

See footnotes at end of table, p. 117.

1. Students in the upper 12 percent to 15 percent of the populations in terms of IQ are encouraged to enroll in these classes.

2. 1. Honors classes are offered in most schools in English, history, and civics, and sometimes in other subjects.

TABLE II.—Summary of reports of grouping practices from selected urban school districts 500,000 and over in population: Secondary school (7-12) 1. Continued

School district	Grouping practices	Flexibility of grouping	Criteria for grouping	Frequency of reevaluation of pupil placement	Effectiveness of grouping practices
San Francisco Calif.-----	<p>2. Slow moving or remedial classes are established in most schools in English, history, civics, and sometimes in other subjects.</p> <p>3. Grouping is achieved in some subjects by establishing class suitable for students of higher or lower ability. In mathematics, for instance, both geometry and general mathematics are offered in the 10th grade, and students are assigned to them in terms of their ability. Similarly, a chemistry course is offered for college preparatory students in the 11th grade, while other students may take a less rigorous course such as applied science.</p> <p>4. Special "adjustment" classes for slow students in academic subject.</p> <p>5. Natural selection results in ability grouping as work becomes more advanced in such subjects as foreign languages, mathematics, and science. In addition, advanced placement classes permit college level work in senior high schools by students capable of such work.</p>	-----	<p>2. Students are counseled into 11, 12 classes on the basis of school achievement and mental ability.</p> <p>3. In terms of pupil's ability.</p> <p>4. Students who test 70 IQ and below are assigned to lower classes.</p> <p>5. Capability of pupils.</p>	-----	<p>1. This includes the physically handicapped, the cerebral palsied, the deaf, the hard of hearing, the partially sighted and so on. Also, there are vocal teachers for</p>
San Diego, Calif.-----	"In the sense of having a 2- or 3-track system," the San Diego schools are not organized on an ability group basis." However, the ability of a pupil is used to place pupils in class groups in a variety of ways, some of which are:	<p>1. Classes for the physically handicapped.</p>			

<p>2. Classes for the mentally retarded. At the high school level, the attempt is made to emphasize some low-skilled vocational competence. These students receive a certificate of completion rather than a diploma. There is also a special school to which the extremely mentally retarded or trainable pupils are transported.</p> <p>3. Classes for the gifted and talented. This may take the form of acceleration through taking an extra load; honors classes in which the content is more significant than in the normal classes; special guidance projects or the taking of work for college credit while still in high school. This work is taken in district-operated junior colleges.</p>	<p>3. Gifted and talented pupils.</p>	<p>Pupil's placement may be reevaluated as often as every 6 to 12 weeks.</p>	<p>Evaluation indicates the present system is helpful; future plans provide for evaluation, extension, and/or limitation as conditions warrant.</p>	<p>There is no State system; each school seems satisfied with its own system.</p>
<p>Dade County, Fla., (Miami).</p>	<p>Grouping is essentially heterogeneous; however, 4 ability levels in 7th and 9th grade mathematics exist; basic math 9 and basic English 9 exist in grade 9; and advanced science is offered in grade 9. In grades 10-12 (high school), there are honors classes in English and advanced placement classes in mathematics. Different curriculums in biology and chemistry are also provided.</p>	<p>Pupils are not in the same ability group for all subjects; there is a flexible system.</p>	<p>Teacher judgment. Test scores; pertinent, standardized test scores. Previous scholastic record.</p>	<p>Varies with the school organization.</p>
<p>State of Hawaii</p>	<p>May be ability grouping, but varies from school to school.</p>	<p>Varies.</p>	<p>Test scores. Teacher judgment. Grades.</p>	<p>The aim is for continual evaluation.</p>
<p>New Orleans, La.</p>	<p>Pupils are grouped according to interest, aptitude, and ability.</p>	<p>Systems are flexible for all subjects.</p>	<p>Academic record. Achievement score. Teacher judgment. Age. Motivation.</p>	<p>Where grouping is judiciously done and teacher performance and expectations acknowledge the "why" of the grouping, such grouping tends to be effective. [Grouping To Meet Individual Needs of Secondary School Pupils," p. A.42-A.43.]</p>

TABLE II.—Summary of reports of grouping practices from selected urban school districts (continued) and order in population: Secondary school
(2-12) 1-2—Continued

School district	Grouping practices	Flexibility of grouping	Criteria for grouping	Frequency of reevaluation of pupil placement	Effectiveness of grouping practices
Baltimore, Md.	<p>Several types of grouping are used:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instruction is by subject within a given class. 2. Grouping based on various curriculums offered by the school. 3. Grouping based on the objective courses offered by the school. 4. Grouping resulting from individual and other groupings. 5. Grouping resulting from a cross emphasis on basic subjects. Large group small group combination. 6. Grouping resulting when individual attention is given to pupils not to be confused with others in a board grouping according to whether a given student is placed in a particular section in all courses. <p>There are also special programs for the mentally retarded.</p> <p>In addition to the questionnaire answers, a March 1964 postscript, "Grouping to Meet Individual Needs of Secondary School Pupils," and 1967 by the Baltimore City Schools, was attached. It reports that at the high level there are 127 total programs of special curriculum for the mentally retarded; the basic curriculum for slow learners; (a) general vocational curriculum; and (b) accelerated and enrichment curriculums offering the 3 years of work in 2 years.</p> <p>At the high school level the pamphlet reports multiple curriculums as follows: (a) College preparatory curriculum for students of superior ability; (b) regular college preparatory; (c) vocational-technical high schools; (d) general curriculums; (e) basic curriculum; (f) special curriculum.</p>	<p>When a pupil enters:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grouping based on a given curriculum. 2. Grouping based on various curriculums offered by the school. 3. Grouping based on the objective courses offered by the school. 4. Grouping resulting from individual and other groupings. 5. Grouping resulting from a cross emphasis on basic subjects. Large group small group combination. 6. Grouping resulting when individual attention is given to pupils not to be confused with others in a board grouping according to whether a given student is placed in a particular section in all courses. <p>There are also special programs for the mentally retarded.</p> <p>In addition to the questionnaire answers, a March 1964 postscript, "Grouping to Meet Individual Needs of Secondary School Pupils," and 1967 by the Baltimore City Schools, was attached. It reports that at the high level there are 127 total programs of special curriculum for the mentally retarded; the basic curriculum for slow learners; (a) general vocational curriculum; and (b) accelerated and enrichment curriculums offering the 3 years of work in 2 years.</p> <p>At the high school level the pamphlet reports multiple curriculums as follows: (a) College preparatory curriculum for students of superior ability; (b) regular college preparatory; (c) vocational-technical high schools; (d) general curriculums; (e) basic curriculum; (f) special curriculum.</p>	<p>In grades 4-9 (Junior high school)</p> <p>1. Continual</p> <p>2. Continual</p>	<p>In grades 4-9 (Junior high school)</p> <p>1. Continual</p> <p>2. Continual</p>	<p>Very well • • • . The effectiveness of ability grouping depends upon the direction in which it is self-directed and reinforced • • • . Grouping is not demand in itself. It is an administrative device. The important thing is what teachers do to evaluate and maintain within the groups formed.</p>

Detroit, Mich.	Grouping by ability is accepted as desirable at times and for some purposes. Ability grouping is used extensively, but the attempt is made to allow considerable opportunity for the professional staffs in the schools to use judgment when grouping is most helpful.	Try to be as flexible as practical considerations permit.	[Presumably.] Grade and marks. Test results. Teacher judgement.	[No answer.]	"The end [of grouping pupils] * * is having the pupil in the best possible situation for his learning."
St. Louis, Mo.	Secondary schools use the three-track system.	There is a flexible system. Standardized mathematics test scores determine the mathematics track to be taken while the standardized reading test score determines all other subject tracks.	Test scores (from standar-dized tests); Track 1: Reading 9.2 and above; mathematics 8.7 and above. Track 2: Reading 7.2 to 9.1; mathematics 7.2 to 8.6. Track 3: Reading: Below 7.2; mathematics: Below 7.2.	Based on class grades and tests and principal-counselor-teacher judgments, a pupil can move from 1 track to another as his educational progress indicates.	The 3-track system has enabled students to take courses from which they can profit. Low achievement students are placed in classes where they can learn and also experience the feeling of success. High achievement pupils now take courses that are a challenge to their abilities. Each student under the track system has the chance to pursue his education suited to his level of achievement.
Buffalo, N.Y.	Grouping in grades 9-12 is by a track system including honors, average, slow learners, and mentally retarded groups.	There is a flexible system, allowing pupils to be in different groups for different subjects.	Mental ability. General achievement.	Continual.	This system has worked well at this level in 2 respects: reduced failure in the slow learner groups, and provided honors group pupils with the opportunity to acquire advanced placement in college.
New York, N.Y.	In a variety of grouping systems, depending on the policy determined by the particular high school principal.	There are honor classes and classes for slower learners. Pupils may be grouped in honor classes for 1 or more subject areas. The grouping system is flexible.	Ability.	Semiannually, generally. In special instances, when indicated.	Works effectively.

TABLE II.—Summary of reports of grouping practices from selected urban school districts 500,000 and over in population: Secondary school (7-12) 12—Continued

School district	Grouping practices	Flexibility of grouping	Criteria for grouping	Frequency of reevaluation (or pupil placement)	Effectiveness of grouping practices
Cleveland, Ohio	In grades 7 and 8 pupils are grouped homogeneously by ability in separate classes.	In grades 7 and 8 pupils are grouped in the same class for all subjects. In the subjects of English, mathematics, science, and social studies, the teacher can take advantage of recommendations of the Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction. Test scores, achievement, and teacher evaluation and teaching should be based on a 3-year cycle.	General intelligence as determined by a written test, and achievement in English, mathematics, science, and social studies. In the subjects of English, mathematics, science, and social studies, the teacher can take advantage of recommendations of the Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction.	Pupils may be placed in other groups at any time, but not until after reevaluation at the beginning of a semester and the recommendation of the teacher and guidance counselors.	The grouping system is good for secondary but is now outstripping pupils for placement in greater schools in the 7th and 8th grades and also in the 11th and 12th grades. At the senior high level, skill centers are being established to provide instruction in vocational areas for pupils of average and less than average ability.
Cincinnati, Ohio	Secondary pupils are grouped into 3 broad categories: academic, vocational, and basic. Further grouping results from the sheltered education program and the advanced placement program.	Flexible grouping system. Pupils stay and do the courses at different levels of difficulty.	Test of recent achievement, and final achievement in English, mathematics, science, and social studies. Test scores standardized tests.	Annually, and with individual pupils during 1st semester.	Fairly well. At the present time grouping is done in English, mathematics, science, and the social studies. Many staff members urge that grouping practices be extended to other subject areas.
Philadelphia, Pa.	Junior high (grades 7-9): Grouped by 3 combinations of ability and achievement according to a standard score which is compiled from a mass of scores of various kinds obtained through the elementary and junior high school years.	Junior high: Groups have classes which remain the same through all or most classes.	Ability and achievement in various all or areas reading, mathematics, very slightly, and so on. (See <i>Individual Grouping Practices</i> .)	Junior high: Full year with frequent reclassification during the year.	Junior high: When grouped generally by ability and achievement, the grouping is not as good for reading or mathematics, etc. Grouping according to each subject would be better in some respects, but would not solve grouping for topics within the subject.
	Senior high (grades 10-12): Where the number of pupils warrant they are grouped by subject ability in various subject areas.	Senior high: Pupils are grouped in different ability groups for different subjects except in modified curriculum.	Senior high: Test scores reading, verbal ability, Marks or grades. Teachers' judgment.	Senior high: Each year but choices are made any time during the year when severe misplacement is evident.	Senior high: In general the grouping works out well, provided the school organization is feasible enough to make senior high.

where pupils follow the same schedule.	Pupil's objectives or goals.	necessary changes when the need arises.
In a variety of patterns but primarily on ability.	IQ. Achievement. Teacher and principal recommendations.	When necessary in terms of progress.
Houston, Tex.	In general grouped by ability in academic subjects. Grouped differently in different subjects in team teaching schools.	Annually.
San Antonio, Tex.	Ability grouping in basic subject areas. There are special classes for the academically able in some subjects.	Teacher judgment. Marks. Achievement test scores. Teacher judgment. Student and parent request.
Seattle, Wash.	Students are grouped according to ability in the following areas: English, mathematics, history, and science.	Teacher judgment. Test scores; reading and mathematics, and IQ. (the least of all). Past performance.
Milwaukee, Wis.	By ability.	There is a flexible system.

¹ (7-12)—Grades 7 through 12, broadly the secondary grades (in most places, grades 7 through 9 comprise a junior high school; grades 10 through 12, a high school). However, some fewer school systems retain the earlier organizational plan of an elementary school including grades K-8 and a high school of grades 10 through 12.

² This chart summarizes the answers reported by selected urban school districts 500,000 and over in population regarding grouping practices in their secondary schools.

TABLE III.—*Summary of reports of grouping practices from selected urban school districts 500,000 and over in population: General*¹

School district	Effectiveness of grouping practices in meeting needs of culturally disadvantaged pupils
Los Angeles, Calif.	<p>“Our general grouping classifications are sufficiently broad to meet the individual needs of all schools. Programs stressing remedial education and cultural enrichment constitute an important phase of the grouping procedures at the second level and especially in those schools with a significant number of pupils from a culturally disadvantaged environment.”</p>
San Francisco, Calif.	<p>“The needs of culturally disadvantaged pupils are a major consideration in all educational decisions in this district. We feel that the grouping plans used here at the respective levels are effective in meeting those needs ***</p>
	<p>“Administrators of schools [junior highs] having students from culturally deprived areas give special consideration to the distribution of these students throughout all the broad ability grouping in order to effect good ethnic balance along with the other related social and educational needs of the students.”</p>
San Diego, Calif.	
Dade County, Fla. (Miami).	<p>“A basic skills learning laboratory has been established in certain schools for culturally different secondary level students. In laboratories such as these, emphasis is not only on basic skills, but on enriching and enlarging experimental background.”</p>
State of Hawaii	<p>“As well as any system.”</p>
New Orleans, La.	<p>“*** if deprivation is a primary consideration for grouping and acknowledged in teacher performance such grouping tends to work to the distinct advantage of the culturally disadvantaged pupil.”</p>
Baltimore, Md.	<p>“Grouping organization plan works very well, but burgeoning school population makes it difficult to keep up with the provision of facilities. Hence, class size remains too large.”</p>
Detroit, Mich.	<p>“There is no significant difference we can note in the advantages and disadvantages of grouping for the culturally disadvantaged. We try to see that we do not keep any economic, ethnic, racial, religious [or] sex group from having working relationships with other groups when it will contribute to their academic, social, or other learning.”</p>
St. Louis, Mo.	<p>“We feel the provisions such as the ungraded primary and the track system are quite instrumental in gearing programs to actual need. However, we feel that Operation Headstart will be a big help and that some of the programs planned under Public Law 89-10 will enable us to more effectively meet the needs of the culturally disadvantaged.”</p>

See footnote at end of table, p. 119.

TABLE III.—*Summary of reports of grouping practices in school districts 500,000 and over in population*

School district	Effectiveness of grouping practices disadvantaged
Buffalo, N.Y.	"The flexibility of grouping has been an essential ingredient in the schools to assimilate and educate the culturally disadvantaged and disadvantaged. Both educationally and socially, however, it must be shown that classroom grouping is a technique for ameliorating cultural disadvantages."
New York, N.Y.	"We provide supplementary services for the culturally disadvantaged such as, additional guidance services, smaller after-school study classes, etc."
Cleveland, Ohio	"**** we have moved to provide all pupils greater opportunity for vocational training. Experimental programs have indicated that culturally disadvantaged pupils can be motivated when they recognize the practical application of their schoolwork. Our classes for academically talented pupils are also operated to meet the needs of culturally disadvantaged pupils of high scholastic potential."
Cincinnati, Ohio	"With an increase in available materials, sympathetic teachers, and more flexible scheduling, the grouping practices help meet the needs of disadvantaged pupils."
Philadelphia, Pa.	"In schools with many culturally disadvantaged pupils grouping frequently varies according to needs. The range of IQ, reading scores, and pupils' grades would differ greatly from that found as criteria in groups in a school with more academic pupils."
Pittsburgh, Pa.	No answer to this question.
Houston, Tex.	"Satisfactory."
San Antonio, Tex.	"Grouping of the educationally disadvantaged students has helped the morale of these students. This, in turn, has reduced the number of dropouts."
Seattle, Wash.	"Good."
Milwaukee, Wis.	<p>"Grouping as implemented in the continuous progress philosophy in our primary school and the grouping in regular classes for the various subject areas both serve to provide a framework for instruction to meet the individual differences including the disadvantaged."</p> <p>"The criteria applied to the identification and selection on a citywide basis for the superior ability program provides opportunity for all Milwaukee public school students to be included in the program."</p> <p>"Additionally, a number of new programs have been initiated in the Milwaukee public schools to provide special guidance and instruction for the disadvantaged."</p>

¹ The answers to this question relating to grouping practices applies to procedures in both elementary and secondary grades.

